

**Minutes of Governor's Workforce Investment Board**  
**a.k.a.**  
**State Workforce Investment Board (SWIB)**  
**June 15, 2006 1:00 p.m.**

---

**Board Members Present:** Arthur E. Nathan, Debra Baez, Michael Bahn, Maureen Brower, Mary-Ann Brown, Richard Carpenter, Pam Egan, Lee Forbes, Elizabeth Ghanem, Sidney Hendrickson, Terry Johnson, Senator John Lee, Richard Lee, Cass Palmer, Tim Rubald, D. Taylor, Assemblywoman Valerie Weber, and Mike Willden.

**Board Member Representatives Present:** Robert Brewer represented by Chester Richardson, Keith Rheault represented by Phyllis Dryden,

**Board Members Absent:** Michael Bertoldi, Kirk Clausen, Mark Furman, Phyllis Hunewill, Leslie Martin, Assemblywoman Euginia Ohrenschall, Tom Peacock, Michael Peltyn, Jean Peyton, Cam Sorenson, Senator Randolph Town

**Guests:** Mae Flennoy, Moshe Bialac, Michael Hadra, Stanley Scott, Lynda Parven, Maite Salazar, Ardell Galbreth, Richard Blue, Connie Williams, Val Hopkins, David Haws, Bob Wolf, Mick Coleman, Marty Ramirez, Larry Pearson, Cindy Jones, Joe Reel, Renee Olson, Bob Bryant and Tom Fitzgerald

**Staff:** Tamara Nash, Board Liaison

**Agenda Item I. – Welcome**

**Agenda Item II. – Roll Call and Confirmation of Quorum** – Tamara Nash called roll and it was determined there was a quorum. Chairman Nathan called the meeting to order.

**Chair:** Arthur Nathan, Chair welcomed everyone and thanked the members for their attendance. Mr. Nathan announced that Karla McComb had passed away and asked for a moment of silence in her honor. Mr. Nathan announced two new board members. Senator John Lee served on the senate and the assembly during three regular and four special sessions. Senator Lee is President and owner of Las Plumbing Service and Champion Title and Marble and is affiliated with many community activities and organizations. Being a small business owner and a Legislator Senator Lee brings a great deal to our board and we are thrilled to welcome him. The Chair also welcomed Dr. Richard Carpenter to represent the Nevada System of Higher Education. Dr. Carpenter is President of Community College of Southern Nevada. Both the northern and southern community colleges have been great supporters and full time partners of workforce development here in Nevada and the board is also thrilled to have Dr. Carpenter.

**Carpenter:** Looking forward to working with the board.

**Agenda Item III. – \*Discussion/Possible Action–Approval of the March 15, 2006, SWIB Agenda**

**Chair:** Do I have a motion on accepting the minutes?

1:11:05 So moved.

**Chair:** I have a motion, do I have a second?

**Lee:** Second.

**Chair:** We have a second. Any discussion? . All those in favor of accepting the minutes, say aye.

**Board:** Aye.

**Chair:** All opposed, same sign. Motion carried. Thank you very much. Director Johnson from DETR has an announcement.

**Johnson:** Thank you Mr. Chair, for the record, we are joined by Maureen Brower from the Governor's office and we are glad to have her here as well.

**Agenda Item IV. – Discussion/Possible Action on the Approval of Revisions to the following Workforce Investment Act (WIA) State Compliance Policies**

**a. Section 3.4 - Cash Management**

**Nash:** Due to the recent revisions to the state board bylaws, the board members that have designees representing them today do not have the ability to have proxy votes. Although we appreciate them being in attendance and would like them to participate in the discussion, they will not be allowed to vote on any action items.

**Chair:** If you insist. I guess we have to follow those bylaws -- don't we?

**Nash:** Back to the agenda item. Mr. Chair members of the Board, for the record my name is Tamara Nash and I am State Board Liaison and Assistant to the Director of the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. Also seated at the table today with me today is Larry Pearson, DETR's Chief Auditor and Valorie Hopkins, Chief of DETR's Workforce Investment Support Services. Mr. Pearson and I are here today to present agenda item IV (a), which is the Workforce Investment Act (WIS) State Compliancy Policy 3.4 Cash Management. Ms. Hopkins will present agenda item IV (b) Documenting Veterans Status. First of all I would like to give you a little background as to the reason that the Cash Management Policy is before you for consideration today. Our Director Terry Johnson has asked Larry and I to conduct an in depth review of all WIA related policies and procedures to ensure compliance and accountability with the provisions and requirements of the Act and other federal related directives and policies. Due to the particular importance of accountability in the area of cash management Director Johnson asked us to start our review with this policy. The revisions to this policy not only reflect corrections to system inadequacies that were found in our review of the Act and related documents but also our review of both DETR and Local Workforce Investment Board cash management processes. I will now turn it over to Mr. Pearson who will walk you through the major revisions to this policy.

**Pearson:** Mr. Chairman members of the Board for the record my name is Larry Pearson, Chief Auditor for the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. Over the course of the review a number of deficiencies were discovered with DETR, Local Boards and the service providers when it came to the requesting of cash the analysis of the cash request and the disbursement of cash to the perspective local boards and providers. The request for funds form that the local boards prepare for their cash request did not reflect providers that were requesting cash nor was there any back-up documentation showing the delineation of these funds i.e. program cost, salaries, supplies etc. An inspection of our department's Workforce Investment Support Services unit policies for cash requests showed that although the unit was ensuring that there was an adequate amount of money available in a grant to continue funding of the provider and its operations, there was no knowledge of any possible over-funding or overspending by a provider. As for the disbursement of funds to the local boards or their providers, there has been inadequate oversight by DETR as to how these funds are being allocated by the provider and/or the local board. In other words, it was next to impossible to determine the allocation of these funds or if these funds were being used for past, current, or future operational needs.

Therefore, in order for DETR to ensure the proper disbursement of, and accounting for these Workforce Investment Act funds, the revisions to the State's compliance policies in regards to cash management are as follows:

- 1.) Except under certain circumstances, all cash transactions between units of DETR, the local boards, and the providers will be conducted on a cost reimbursement basis only;
- 2.) When requesting a WIA reimbursement, the local board must attach the appropriate "Request for Reimbursement Detail" to their "Request for Reimbursement" form.
- 3.) A review of a local board or provider's Request for Reimbursement submissions, whether on-site or at DETR offices, will be conducted on at least a quarterly basis.

Incorporating these three aforementioned procedures, along with the other corresponding procedures contained in this proposed cash management policy revision, will ensure the proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds that are allocated to local boards and their various providers.

I thank the Chairman and the members of the Board for the opportunity to bring this matter before them. I would be happy to entertain any questions at this time regarding these matters.

**Chair:** Larry, if I understand you correctly, and I may not. Are you saying that there are no cash advances and that it is on a reimbursement basis only?

**Pearson:** No. In number one I said "*except under certain circumstances*, all cash transactions between units of DETR, the local boards, and the providers will be conducted on a cost reimbursement basis only". In the board packet it is listed where the exceptions are for that. Roman numeral three, under tab four, page 2 or 3.

**Chair:** And the reason to allow advances is what?

**Pearson:** The reason to allow an advance would be if it was...say it was a new provider that was just starting up and they needed start-up funds or in the case if you had an extra ordinary item occur during the year. That way if it was extra ordinary it wouldn't be expected if there was an electrical storm hit all your computers get wiped out and you need to go ahead and get computers right away to keep things going, that would be considered an extra ordinary cost that we would advance funds in that case.

**Chair:** And if there are advance funds what is the audit process to guarantee that those are not mis-advanced.

**Pearson:** Basically we would go ahead and look at their track record we would make a notation of their funds and then we would see the bills that were coming in to support those items that were advanced. We would look for any question regarding what we advanced and what was actually disbursed by the local board or provider and then we would go ahead with follow-up questions after that.

**Chair:** Will each cash advance be audited?

**Pearson:** Yes they will be.

**Chair:** This is a significant change in our practice or is this state practice in general.

**Pearson:** This would be a change from what has been going on in the past. This would allow greater tracking of cash. Right now we do not know if someone makes a cash request on a reimbursement form which provider it is going to. We can track and monitor things that way plus it would afford us when it came time for the audits we have documentation we can look through and monitor on an on-going basis, rather than once a year.

**Chair:** Is this consistent with state policy in other areas?

**Nash:** Yes, Mr. Chair it does state in the Act that all cost will be on a reimbursement basis so we are just going back to realign everything with the Act.

- Chair:** Any other questions or comments on this cash management process?
- Forbes:** Larry, I just want to understand are these changes designed to get us in line with the generally excepted accounting principles. Is that the motive behind it? Or is it for the convenience of DETR or what is motivating the changes?
- Pearson:** Basically, the former, putting it in line with generally accepted accounting principles Mr. Forbes.
- Forbes:** Thank you.
- Richardson:** I have a concern on this policy when it says, down here on "C" under "Advances". It says, that a sub-grantee will not be eligible for cash advance I may have come in too late for that, but if they are considered high risk as defined by WIA, and it goes on to give that designation. Two concerns, one is that I'm concerned that being designated high risk in my opinion should not preclude you from receiving an advance automatically. I think there should be some flexibility based on circumstances and the state should decide where or not to enforce that policy or to grant that advance rather than it being an automatic because you are designated high risk. Just because you're high risk does not mean you can't be granted a federal contract then you should have the benefits of having the ability to request an advance. I'm just asking that this be considered and see if they can't be a little more flexible.
- Chair:** I think the definition of high risk is further clarified in "D". Being high risk doesn't preclude you from bidding or being awarded.
- Richardson:** My concern is being denied the opportunity to receive an advance.
- Chair:** I think just before you came in Chester, Larry was highlighting the reasons where an exception to this would be granted for start-up fees or to recover from some major problem that has occurred. I think this is consistent with the Act itself and I don't want to restrict the prerogatives of the local boards, but I also want to be financially responsible. Terry you want to make a comment.
- Johnson:** Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think in terms of whether or not to providing advanced to a provider that's high risk comes down to at least two questions. One is a practical one, but the other is a legal or statutory one. I think as a practical matter you have to ask yourself is it appropriate use of monies to give to someone who has shown through their accounting practices, through their operations, advances, cash advances in such circumstances. Where the latitude is in regards to Mr. Richardson's statement concerning flexibility would fall in determining whether or not someone is high risk. And that criteria as to whether or not they may be considered high risk. That's where the latitude is given to look at the history of their performance, to look at their financial stability, to look at their financial staff, whether or not there's been any turnover. But I think that's a practical question that you have to answer as to whether or not it's appropriate under the circumstances to advance monies to persons who haven't shown an ability to properly account for and handle previous monies. Now, as to the legal question, I think there's dramatically less latitude to be had. You'll see where staff has inserted various citations to the Act and in general, this is supposed to be a system premised upon cost reimbursements. And they've cited to Section 184 of the Act. They've cited to other circulars published by the White House's Office of Management and Budget. I think there is significantly less latitude if you look at it from a legal standpoint to award an advance. But where you look at it legally or practically, it's not good business to make cash advances to entities that have raised doubts about their ability to handle the cash.
- Richardson:** Mr. Chairman, here is my issue. If a fresh award is made, and you make an award to an agency that has been designated high risk, you have already made a statement that you have some confidence in that agency to perform. Even though they have the designation of the high risk. The high risk is not a punishment. It is a guide to ensure that you come back into compliance and that you stay in fiscal compliance. All I am saying is, and I'm not talking about current because as Mr. Johnson said that if there's a history shown, blah, blah, blah, of course you're going to be concerned about giving them an advance. But new awards that we make to an agency, if we go through the trouble of awarding a high

risk agency, then clearly we should not restrict ourselves in providing them an advance if they need to do so. I'm just saying I would appreciate that consideration of flexibility and the statutes do not preclude that at all. And even if you look at the last line of number 5, it says an entity that does not have prior managing federal funds may also be considered high risk. So let's understand that you could've done nothing wrong, but because you've never handled federal funds before, the granting agency can designate you high risk before they give you the funds. So, it's not always exclusive.

**Chair:** Point well taken, Chester. I think it's a point well made. But, where an agency is a current high risk, and has exhibited all of the criteria outlined here as high risk, I would like to suggest, and it's only a suggestion, that the two local boards be very careful about even awarding them anything. Because we are responsible for the public's money and we are accountable to the public's trust. And, if this money gets off in ways that doesn't do the process any good and there's no good outcome of it, then we are going to be criticized and frankly, I don't care to be criticized. We're volunteers here, ladies and gentlemen. Yes, ma'am.

**Weber:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to know if an agency, if an entity is considered high risk if that's knowledgeable to that group or if they come for the cash advance that they're unaware of that. I mean, are these folks aware that they're in that category based on an audit, based on all these criteria? Whoever the entity is that's considered high risk.

**Johnson:** I believe I can answer that for you, Mr. Chairman. They would be aware of their designation as high risk. I mean, there's monitoring that should be going on I think more than what has been. But there would be monitoring to make those determinations. But, there's kind of a stop gap too that when the request for monies come in from this point forward, the Board has to identify to whom that money is to go. And if there is anything, for example, in the State's records that indicates that that person has been designated high risk or there's some other problems or questions that need to be answered, that would be the time to catch it before the State releases the money to the Board to release to those providers.

**Chair:** You know, I have sensitivity to an agency that may be financially unstable. Because it's hard to get started up. It's hard to get your feet on the ground. There's no question about that and I think that we should be as generous as we can to groups like that to foster them along and help them to get started if they do good work. But if you read the other things, criteria, indeed the entity has a history of unsatisfactory performance, I think we should be unbending about denying them either a grant or the money. Prior reviews disclosed that the entity has a management system that does not meet the cash management standards. The entity has not conformed to the terms and conditions of previous awards. I think that performance is what the Workforce Investment Act is all about. And we've all been here, many of us, long enough to be part of this process of performance based. And we should be very sensitive to that.

**Brown:** I'm just wondering, if someone gets identified as high risk, if there's an action plan put in place. What's the process? Because for me, that would be the better check and balance. If you're a grantee who's received funding and you're having difficulty particularly in the financial management area and you're audited, then there should be a very tight corrective action plan which may include you don't get cash advances because you are at risk for not managing your money well. So it seems to me there would also need to be a response to being designated high risk and one of those things may be the restriction of cash advances. So is there some sort of plan if an organization develops this area of problem through auditing?

**Johnson:** I think throughout the Workforce Investment Act there is a theme that where you have an under performing provider, or even if you have a board that's struggling in certain areas, that there is an affirmative responsibility to provide them with technical assistance. Particularly if it is a current provider. That you try as best as possible to keep from just severing the relationship in one fell swoop. Now if it's somebody that's coming up for an allocation, you look at those before you even make the decision to allocate the money in the first place. But I think, in answer to your question, there is a theme throughout the workforce environment that certain persons, organizations such as DETR, the State agencies, the local boards, they have an affirmative responsibility to provide technical assistance

where it's warranted and where it's appropriate.

**Brown:** So, wouldn't that sort of answer Chester's question about as part of that analysis, removal of the ability to get a cash advance, if part of the action plan is you're not doing well enough fiscally, we still want to give you a chance to improve, but we're not going to give you any money advance because you have trouble in this area. Or no money at all, because I'm with you, these are serious allegations in terms of mismanaging resources or potential fraud.

**Chair:** Well, I think again, it sounds to me like the sense of the Board is that we want to be very sensitive to the providers and the grantees. We want to make sure that we do the right thing. Terry, would you please guide us? How hard and fast is this? How much latitude may a local board have in considering this? And, how do we move forward with implementing this cash management policy?

**Johnson:** Mr. Chairman, there would be a reasonable expectation that any decision made by a local board, made by the State agency would be void of any arbitrariness, any capriciousness, that any decision that is made is supported by whatever facts, whatever evidence they may have in their possession. But it's not something to be taken lightly. I want to underscore the importance of ensuring that there's service delivery to the persons in the communities throughout the state that need that service. And so this is a very serious step. When you have gotten to this point that somebody has made a determination that you're not financially stable and you've got too much turnover in your financial personnel, when it's gotten to this point here I think that it takes on a certain level of seriousness. But, I think in answer to your question, it is not something that anyone would take lightly. Any decision made in this regard should be supported by the evidence. Any person who is aggrieved by a decision under these circumstances, I would imagine would have some level of review by someone besides he or she who made that initial determination. I would support, certainly, a second set of eyes taking a look at that. I don't have a problem with it but I don't think that this something that would be handed out arbitrarily or capriciously. It would be something that would be made after a careful review of the tract record of a vendor or a service provider in this area. So I think there would be due diligence on behalf of whoever makes the finding that an entity is at high risk.

**Chair:** And I see these as being further guidance to the boards and further definition of what we all should be in agreement with anyways. So, thank you for those comments. Any other comments about this? Yes, ma'am.

**Egan:** I just wonder if it might be something to consider. I'm thinking about the example that was given about say, there's a lightning storm and an agency has been designated high risk. They're moving forward on their action plan. They're doing well. They get hit by a lightning storm. Computers are gone. They need a cash advance to get some computers to keep doing business. I wonder if it might be possible to add an exception that says, under extraordinary circumstances upon review by the Director of the Department or some sort of final recognition of sometimes in that circumstance there may be a case and it would be carefully reviewed by the Director or somebody with that final fiscal responsibility that that might maybe resolve sort of that little exception that is always there to the rule.

**Bahn:** Adding a huge burden to Mr. Johnson if we implement something like that. There's already precedence for disbursement of federal funds has some idea how it is done. My company, the federal contractor, and these things are a given which you cannot oppose. Also, Chester or anybody else, these are something we have to implement.

**Lee:** This is Richard Lee. I think the Act is pretty strong. I think it says what it says. I make a motion to approve it and let's move on.

**Bahn:** Second.

**Chair:** Okay. We have a motion. Do we have a second.

**Chair:** Okay. I suppose we're supposed to have the motion first, before we have the discussion. I always

make that mistake. I think we've had some good discussion here. Is, this is a pretty far-reaching thing we're doing here. Is there any public comment on this? Anybody cares to weigh in? Okay. Any other discussion of the Board?

**Willden:** Mr. Chairman?

**Chair:** Yes.

**Willden:** Mike Willden, up North. I just want to make sure if we're going to vote that I make sure I understand which way I'm voting. That Section C would mean that no one gets an advance if they are designated high risk so that if DETR wants to give an advance, they must remove the high-risk designation or they will not be advanced.

**Chair:** Unless the extraordinary circumstances are met.

**Willden:** Well, I didn't hear that part being accepted. So is the extraordinary in the motion or not in the motion?

**Chair:** It is in the motion. What is in the board book is in the motion.

**Nash:** There isn't an extraordinary clause in the policy as it stands.

**Pearson:** If you look at Roman Numeral III B, it says advance dollars must be used for either startup costs or costs incurred due to an extraordinary event. An extraordinary event is one that is unusual in nature and infrequent in occurrence.

**Willden:** So you're saying that supercedes the high-risk designation? Even if there's designated high risk, the extraordinary clause in B would be allowed?

**Pearson:** Yes.

**Willden:** Okay.

**Chair:** Yes. Any other comments? Yes, Elizabeth.

**Ghanem:** I just have a comment under Subsection D and the following paragraph, following 1 through 7. Both of those paragraphs say an entity may be considered high risk. An entity both for not having prior experience and then for the following factors. So I think that does in fact give a lot of flexibility because it's not shall. Shall, there's no flexibility in the term shall. Legally speaking may still does still offer some flexibility. So I think everyone kind of needs to keep that in mind. It's still not set in stone when we use the terms may.

**Chair:** Thank you, Elizabeth. Any other comments. Any other up north, Lee? Okay, well we're going to vote on this one first. All those in favor please say Aye.

**Board:** Aye.

**Chair:** All opposed?

**Chair:** Yes, sir.

**Pearson:** Yes, I can see where in Section B where it says advanced dollars must be used for either startup costs or costs incurred. And then C it says the state grantee or sub-grantee will not be eligible for a cash advance if they are considered high risk. The way that this reads right now, it does not appear if you are high risk you would be eligible for the advanced dollars.

**Chair:** If somebody's a startup, I don't think they naturally fall into the high risk. They fall into the unknown.

And I think we should be very sensitive to startups because we do want to foster groups that could be very beneficial to our system. And, being a startup I don't think is high risk.

**Pearson:** Okay.

**Chair:** In and of itself, I think it's unwise for us to assume that a startup is high risk.

**Pearson:** Okay.

**Richardson:** Mr. Chairman?

**Chair:** Yes, sir.

**Richardson:** Just to set the record straight again, I don't know, was that the attorney that was speaking?

**Chair:** No, that was the auditor.

**Richardson:** The auditor, right. So there will be no, once you are designated high risk, when it speaks about may, that those are the list of conditions of which one may be chosen or designated a high risk, if you meet any of these conditions. But once you've been designated high risk, you will not be allowed an advance even under extraordinary circumstances. That needs to be, that's clear. That's the point. That's definite, right?

**Chair:** If a high risk group who gets hit by lightning? The high risk trumps the lightning.

**Johnson:** Based on this, if they've been designated as high risk, yes.

**Richardson:** They get no new computers. They've got to find funds elsewhere. They're not going to get an advance. Okay, I just want to make sure we're all clear on that. There is no help that you're going to get if God acts on you. And second thing, if you're a new organization and you've never received funds before, if the State so designates or the local board so designates, they can designate you a high risk because you've never had federal funds before.

**Chair:** No, I think what Elizabeth pointed out was that the language says, "may." May not grant them but you can if the local boards chose in a startup to grant that. I think we want to allow that type of flexibility because the local boards are supposed to have their finger on the pulse. But what we're trying to do is protect all of us from the abyss of losing money because our hearts sometimes are a little bit bigger than our brains. And you want to give this money. You want to help somebody out and when you're tossing the lost dollar after the worst dollar, it's not smart. We are, at the end of the day, the keepers of the public's money and trust. We just have to keep remembering that. But I don't want to pour cold water on the local board's decisions any more than we can. So I would encourage intelligent thinking. Terry, how do you get that high-risk designation? I mean, is that some automatic thing or is it somebody just, there's a process that leads up to it?

**Johnson:** I think there has to be a finding. As I said, it can't be something arbitrary. Somebody wake up one day and say you're high risk. I mean we all have responsibilities to conduct monitoring. The local boards must monitor their performance providers. The State must monitor the local boards. The U.S. Department of Labor monitors the State. There's a pattern there of monitoring activity that has to take place and a record established, as to whether or not somebody warrants a high risk designation.

**Chair:** Okay. In the consideration of time, I think we've discussed most of this. You get one minute, Richard. You were sitting there when I asked for it. Please sit down and use the microphone so those people up north can here you.

**Blue:** Richard Blue, Executive Director of the Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Board. On page 2 of 3, under III C, maybe as a point of clarification, in the first sentence, a state grantee or sub-grantee, just

a recommendation to change it to will not be eligible to shall not be eligible.

**Chair:** No. Will it is. Shall, I think Elizabeth raised a good point. That there's a difference between may, shall and will. And this is pretty unequivocal. Alright. I'd like to call for the vote here. All those in favor of the motion, please say Aye.

**Board:** Aye.

**Chair:** All those opposed? The motion is carried. And I would just like to make one last statement. That I encourage the two local boards to use this new policy, or this redefined policy judiciously. Help good people get into the system. And keep your eyes open when somebody truly is a high risk that we have to be careful with. Again, we're the keepers of the money.

#### **B. Section 1.17 - Documenting Veterans Status**

**Chair:** Tami, do you want to step into this one too?

**Nash:** Mr. Chair, Val Hopkins will be presenting the second one.

**Hopkins:** Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. I believe in the packet, you each received the summary of the new policy. Just a brief overview for you. This is a requirement due to data element validation. It became a requirement of DOL three years ago. This is an added component. The DD 214 currently is not being collected, though we did advise both local workforce investment boards when we first received notification that they needed to set a process in place so that for this year they would be able to have this information collected. I'll be happy to address any questions.

**Chair:** Any questions on the documenting of veterans' status. Are we supposed to vote on this Tami?

**Nash:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

**Chair:** Do I have a motion? Do I have a second? Any discussion? Talked ourselves out on the last one, huh? All those in favor please say Aye.

**Board:** Aye.

**Chair:** All opposed? Motion carried. Okay.

#### **Agenda Item V. – \*Discussion/Possible Action on the Approval of the Local Workforce Investment Boards' Two-Year WIA Plans**

**Chair:** Val, you want to lead us through this one?

**Hopkins:** Certainly. First of all, let me say that the Nevadaworks plan is the first one listed for you. My agency's responsibility on that is to verify that the technical requirements of the plan have been met in accord with State Compliance Policy 1.2 and additional federal regulation. The Nevadaworks plan met all of that criteria. Therefore, we would recommend approval. The Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Board plan also met all of the technical requirements and federal requirements. However, I do want to point something out. If you will recall board members and Mr. Chair, we were granted by the Department of Labor, in fact the entire nation was, the opportunity to have plans waived last year based on the fact that WIA re-authorization had not gotten through Congress. As a result of that, Nevadaworks did request a waiver and did receive a waiver, but they did submit their plan this past April which is the plan that's before you for approval. The southern board had advised that they were writing their two-year plan and would not be seeking a waiver. In August, our records indicate they did post their plan and in September, their plan was received at my office on September 30<sup>th</sup>. Due to a very unfortunate and regrettable clerical error, however, that plan did not reach neither my compliance

team or myself. Therefore, it created a delay. My point today is to say that this was not a malfeasance on the part of the southern board. I regret the error. I recommend that the plan be approved since it does meet the technical and federal requirements. I'll answer any questions anybody has.

**Chair:** That's a pretty big statement there, Val. Thank you very much. Terry, you had some questions.

**Johnson:** Thank you Mr. Chairman. I had some questions of the two executive directors regarding their plans, if they would please. Probably if we could start in Northern Nevada. Mr. Fitzgerald, I just wondered if you could elaborate for the Board and the public what all the Nevadaworks Board does in order to determine the needs of the local workforce community, particularly the employers and their needs. But as well as going out and determining the needs of the employees in the workforce. If you could expand on what was referenced in the plan as to how you go about determining the needs of your business community and your employee community on workforce issues.

**Fitzgerald:** Nevadaworks has an ongoing program through the JobConnect System primarily here in Northern Nevada. And, of course, we have a unique situation here with the rural and the urban core. And we serve such a vast and varied group. The businesses in the rural areas versus the businesses in the metro areas and the individuals in the same areas. We have established what we call workforce liaisons on three of our rural counties to make sure that we have somebody within that county advising the Nevadaworks Board on issues that pertain to workforce development, issues that pertain to economic development, issues that pertain to training needs within the counties. And in the urban areas, we get this information not only through the JobConnect Systems but we also have ongoing employer discussion groups. I personally teach a course I offered yesterday to a group of businesses in Sparks about the generational differences in the workforce. In past years we have done the occupational outlook survey where we survey at least 90 businesses in the year. We were unable to do that last year. It is in our budget again for the coming year. So our particular Board members are very active. Our business members are very active in staying in touch with me and presenting information to us that we can utilize in our workforce development plan.

**Johnson:** Thank you. Mr. Blue, same question. How does the Board go about determining the needs of the workforce community whether it is employers or employees?

**Blue:** Richard Blue, Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Board. On the employers' side, first there's the primary source, the Clark County, for the years 2004-2006 wage and growth estimates for demand occupation. Secondly, we work with employer focus groups in our Southern Nevada service delivery area to get feedback. The group that we primarily work are those that were formed by the business development unit out of the JobConnect office. So there's the hospitality, the manufacturing, to name two. We work very closely with the construction trades to find out what their demands are.

**Johnson:** And what do you do with those demands. Like, for example, you referenced the occupational growth data. How is that data being used to develop programs or assistance to those communities?

**Blue:** That is used to more specifically develop the targets in terms of how training dollars will be used for the job seekers. In other words, for job seekers, on the job seekers side we most certainly try to match job seekers with demand occupations. As opposed to a job seeker coming in and saying that I'd like to be a right-handed widget maker as opposed to spending money for that occupation, even though that occupation may remotely exist, we would career counsel or case manage those job seekers into occupations that have number one, represent careers instead of jobs. Long-lasting careers. And, of course, we look at the wages that accompany those careers. So the overall goal is to put people to use our resources to ensure that training matches demand occupation, which also equates to more livable wage types of salaries.

**Johnson:** Thank you. Mr. Chairman, if I may, just one last question for each of them. There's a portion of the plan that talks about the involvement of the local elected officials and the degree to which the Board engages them and their participation in the system. And I was interested in knowing where the Act requires the local elected officials, where there's multiple jurisdictions represented in a workforce area,

such as in Southern Nevada, Las Vegas, Clark County, Henderson, etc., for them to develop an agreement as to how they are going to operate the programs in their workforce investment areas. And I've been looking around for this information as to what constitutes that agreement, in both our workforce investment areas here in North and Southern Nevada. And I wanted to know what is it that constitutes that agreement. The information I have received so far appears to be an agreement between the boards and the local elected officials as to how the two of them are going to relate to and interact with each other. But the Act contemplates an agreement amongst those local elected officials as to how they are going to each or collectively administer their responsibilities. And I wanted to know if you are aware of whether or not an agreement had been developed by and into amongst those local elected officials relating to themselves and how they are going to oversee these systems.

**Blue:** Thank you for that bit of information. At this time, that agreement does not exist in Southern Nevada.

**Johnson:** Okay, thank you. Mr. Fitzgerald.

**Fitzgerald:** I honestly have no idea what you just asked. I know we have a local elected officials' agreement between the thirteen counties represented in our local elected officials' area that I thought has been on file with your agency for many years. But, if not, I can get it. If it's something other than that, then I apologize. I honestly don't know what the question is.

**Johnson:** It was whether or not there was an agreement entered into by the elected officials in your local workforce areas amongst themselves as to how they were going to administer and oversee and particularly like with regards to fiduciary responsibilities. As you know, if there are any misaccountings of monies, or what have you, those local elected officials are financially on the hook. And I would think that would be an item that they would want to discuss and deliberate as to how they're going to go about dealing with those types of issues and other issues as well, when they emerge. So I've seen instances where there's agreement between the board and the LEOs, but I haven't seen an agreement that would possibly meet with the requirements of the Act as to how those elected officials are going to administer that. And if it's not in existence or you're not aware, that's fine. I just wanted to ask while I had the opportunity.

**Blue:** And your question was good. In our local elected official consortium agreement, that's the one that you're referencing and that's the one that you have seen, there are sections to that agreement that talks about the fiduciary responsibility as it relates to disallowed cost. But to respond once again to your question, there is not a separate agreement, separate and apart from that agreement, that is solely amongst the LEOs, or the eight LEOs in this case that talks how that group will perform its duties.

**Johnson:** Thank you, gentlemen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No further questions.

**Chair:** I think Director Johnson raises a good point. The maximum effectiveness of this process involves the local elected officials. And we should be mindful of that. And we should redouble our efforts to make sure that they are actively engaged in this process. Because, as Terry says, they're on the hook. Okay. So we have a motion and a second?

**Willden:** Mr. Chairman? Mike Willden up North. I have a couple of technical questions. I guess that maybe staff could help me understand. The Agenda lists these are two-year plans and I just want to make sure I understand. It appears Southern Nevada Workforce did their public comment in April and May of 2005. So we would be asking to approve a two-year plan that began July 1, 2005, almost a year ago through June 30, 2007. But, the Northern Nevada plan doesn't appear to be a two-year plan, it appears to be a fifteen-month plan that their public comment was taken just recently and is a plan from April 1 to June 30. So, I just need some help on understanding what the two-year, fifteen-month, retroactive, the dates don't jive for me.

**Chair:** Val, you want to explain that?

**Hopkins:** I'll do my best. Nevadaworks took advantage of DOL offering one-year waiver from writing the two-

year plan. Therefore, they did not need to write a plan for this past year. They requested a waiver, the waiver was granted by the then Director of the Department. As a result, the one that they just presented is only to get through the '07.

**Willden:** So, Northern Nevada's is a twelve-month or a fifteen-month?

**Hopkins:** There, it will be twelve months.

**Willden:** Okay. The narrative indicates April 1.

**Hopkins:** I'm sorry, April 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Willden:** April 1, '06 through June 30, '07.

**Hopkins:** I beg your pardon. April 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Chair:** Suffice it to say, it sounds like Val recommends, or the Department recommends that both plans satisfy all the requirements and they are recommending that we adopt them. I think that's pretty succinct, isn't it? Alright. Well, any other comments?

**Baez:** Mr. Chair? Debra Baez, I have two quick questions.

**Chair:** Okay.

**Baez:** Regarding marketing for each of the boards, is there any obligation to show a marketing plan or to share it or is that that we grant the money and then they do that at their level?

**Chair:** Mr. Johnson? I think they do it at their level.

**Baez:** Okay. And the second question has more to do with headlines in the news. Are there safeguards in here to protect social security numbers for people, for job seekers?

**Chair:** I'm sure there aren't.

**Baez:** Because we talked about a drug free workplace. We have specific things on how to keep the workplace drug free, but the question would be how do we protect social security numbers for theft identity issues?

**Johnson:** I couldn't point you to the page where that is referenced in the plan, but I can also tell you that under state law, we have a requirement to maintain the confidentiality of certain information as well, including social security numbers with regards to employees and unemployed persons. And, as a matter of fact, that's something that is the subject of review right now in my office. But yes, we're certainly cognizant of those items. And sensitive to the recent media reports, too, of data that has been compromised amongst various workers.

**Chair:** You had a question?

**Brown:** One quick question, one comment. I know through the plans it talks about how to get feedback from employers and from those seeking services, but there's no process for giving feedback from the providers that you're contracting with. In other words, there's lots of opportunity to feedback in how the programs are doing from the workforce investment side, but no opportunity for your subcontractors or your vendors to give you feedback on the relationship that way. So I just, as someone who has been involved in that level, that would be a wonderful opportunity to make improvements if you're actually asking the vendors you work with to give you feedback on how you work with them. That would be one. I don't see that reflected in the plan.

**Chair:** Good suggestion.

**Brown:** And the second is that as Chair of the Youth Council at the State level, we got these plans and I've asked that the elements that relate to youth get forwarded to my subcommittee, but I'm wondering what kind of process there is for the state entities to be involved with direction and vision for the local plans. Because it's not been very clear in terms of, as the person chairing the Youth Council, what that process looks like.

**Johnson:** I think the bulk of that process is what you're witnessing here and now. The State Board, if that's what you were referring to, this Board has a responsibility to review and approve these plans. So if there's something that this Board, for whatever reason, thinks needs further work or further review or further direction, or maybe some suggestions you wanted to provide programmatically, this would be the forum in which to do so.

**Chair:** My goal is to have the chair on the State Board review those specifically. I mean, if it were a youth program thing, we would take your lead.

**Brown:** Right. But I'm saying I've got a whole committee, a youth committee, so when we get these, they're a done deal. So I'm just asking from a strategic planning standpoint, then our role as the youth council of this body is to just be aware of what these are. It's not to contribute in a strategic or planning way to what exists.

**Johnson:** Do the chairs of the local boards serve on your youth council?

**Brown:** Yes. Well, now they do. And this may be part of our new process that's evolving. Now the two chairs at the youth council's from the local boards serve on the youth council. So that's what I'm thinking. I'm hoping that there's more work done at our level, the youth council from the state level, to help look at the two local plans that are created. Because as it is now, we just receive them to look at after the fact.

**Johnson:** Okay.

**Chair:** Well, I would encourage you to be as collaborative as you choose.

**Brown:** And we'd love to.

**Chair:** Go ahead. There's no restriction.

**Brown:** And now that the chairs are going to be a part of our committee and our committee structure, we look forward to having a bigger role, is what I think I'm saying. So that we're looking at things from a statewide perspective and giving guidance.

**Chair:** It's interesting. Because this whole process is locally driven. That's what we wanted. And we kind of help them along by giving guidance. And to have the state and the local chairs working together, I think helps in the collaboration.

**Brown:** Yes, absolutely.

**Chair:** And we are always hopeful that our chairs on the state board get that interest in.

**Brown:** I hope so.

**Chair:** Not always the case. But we love it when they do. Any other comments? We have a motion, we have a second. We have discussion. I'll bet we can go vote now. Okay. So all those in favor of accepting these two thoughtful plans by the local boards, please say Aye.

**Board:** Aye.

**Chair:** All opposed? Good. They are approved. Very nice.

## **Agenda Item VI. – Status Reports in Board Funded Pilot & Incumbent Worker Projects**

**Fitzgerald:** Update. Bill Pearce Auto Body finishing up the classes this week. As we sit here, a total of 23 will have completed the various auto body classes, including some from other agencies that came in because they spread this throughout the community. We estimate about \$9,500 will be unexpended at the end of the contract and will be not drawn and will be back in the funding cycle for the state workforce board. TMCC classes for the summer began on June 12<sup>th</sup>. This is the start of year three of the three-year project. Everything is on track with expenditures as planned. A year from now, this program will wrap up. Yesterday, I was in a meeting with Dr. Phil Ringold, the President of TMCC was waxing eloquently about the success of this program. So it's an idea that started, now it seems like a long time ago, that seems to be working quite well. The WACA contract finished up in February with a successful program. Over 5,800 contacts were made with presentations at high schools, career fairs, JobConnect offices in both the rural and urban northern area. Interest was recorded in all fourteen construction trades. Women and minority groups were targeted for recruiting purposes. And Nevadaworks will be submitting the closeout reports shortly. And all of the WACA contract was fully expended. Associated Builders and Contractors, the program is currently in closeout. It will finish up a program with 11 students successfully completed the Residential Plumbing Program and we will also be submitting closeout reports on that. That contract also is fully expended. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

**Chair:** Thank you very much. Any questions for Mr. Fitzmarlin?

**Fitzgerald:** Yeah, this could go on a long time.

**Chair:** It could. There's a lot of Fitz's out there.

**Fitzgerald:** You know, as many years as you're going to be there and I'm here, we could bounce this back and forth, couldn't we.

**Chair:** We've been together 27 years now, haven't we, Tom? It seems like it anyways. Okay. Any other questions for Tom? Don't go anywhere, Tom, because you're up again. We're moving right on to the local reports.

## **Agenda Item VII. – Local Workforce Investment Board Reports**

**Chair:** Kirk Clausen, who gets more press than the rest of the Board combined, is unable to attend this meeting. I believe this is Kirk's last meeting. So it's a good one to miss. He expires on June 30<sup>th</sup> and Valerie Glenn will replace him. So please extend our gratitude to Kirk for all of his contributions to the Board during his tenure. And I guess you're going to give us a report on the Northern Board first.

**Fitzgerald:** Well, the report that is in the packet is short this time. And I looked at it as I went through the information. And some days, when you're doing exactly what you're supposed to do and things work the way they're supposed to work, and the months go by as fast as they do, you sit back and look and say, everything went the way it was supposed to. And that's what this report is saying. A lot of time and effort went into the yearly plan and budget preparation. The plan that I thank you for approving not only has all the work that staff does in it, and the thirty-day public comment period, the Board discussion, the rewrites and putting it together, and the next thing we knew, a whole quarter was gone. Kirk Clausen did chair his last board meeting at Nevadaworks as Chair of the Nevadaworks Council last Friday. He will be in that position for two more weeks. Valerie Glenn, who has been the Chair Elect will now take over as the Chair of Nevadaworks. She is the owner of the Rose-Glenn Group in Reno. And our new Chair Elect is Jim Annis. He is the President of Applied Staffing Solutions. So, Valerie, for those of you who know her, is very dynamic in her way and has ideas on where she would

like to see the direction go for the Board, and so I look forward to working with her. And shortly, she will be deciding some directions we want to take at our next board meeting in October.

**Chair:** Thank you very much. Any questions for Tom? Good. Bob Brewer was unable to attend today's meeting but he's not retiring, is he Chester? No, he's not. He gets to serve for a lifetime, I think. Yeah. So, representing Bob today is the Vice Chair of the Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Board, our good friend, Chester Richardson.

**Richardson:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me begin by saying that I recently attended the State Youth Conference that was held in Reno and the State Council, the Chairman, and all those involved with the planning did such a wonderful job. I mean, our youth that participated were tremendously impressed. It was a remarkable event of which I had no part in planning. It inspired us to do a regional one in Southern Nevada in which we would cross over and bring in other youth, now, in the regional area. Boy scouts, faith-based groups, Junior Leagues. I mean, just a cross-section. We want to reach out and see what we can do to impact the lives of youth that we're not often able to help under the WIA regulations. Moving on, as you can see in our written report, here, Arbor, which was formerly ACS held an employer reception to introduce the workforce to local employers. It was very successful. The key point, of course, was the keynote address from our own Board Chairman, Mr. Arte Nathan. Let me tell you, the earth shook and the heavens opened. And I am a changed man. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for those words you shared. I also spoke but he was gone at that point. But I have 300 copies of my speech of which I will share with anyone who wants one. The Pahrump One-Stop anniversary, we opened up a One-Stop in Pahrump and it's been successfully operating now for a year. We did a celebration. It's a very unique blend of One-Stop partners and I encourage anyone who has an opportunity to go out there and check it out and you'll see a unique application of the One-Stop principal out there. U.S. Conference of Mayors was, of course, recently held. They took a tour of one of our service providers, Nevada Partners, and that's always a very impressive facility and operation. And those of you who have not seen it, I encourage you also to come and check it out. The youth bill, we attempted to do that. We had some problems with the collaboration so that grant did not get submitted. And we've never had a youth bill here in Nevada and we need to do that. And we encourage everyone to try to apply for this youth bill. With the reduction in funds, our Board is actively seeking other dollars besides WIA dollars to help augment the services that we feel we need to provide in Southern Nevada. Our youth plan has been submitted. Staff did an admiral job in preparing that. I heard the chairman speak about providing us some input. We would welcome that, certainly. Collaboration is always important and also very much welcome. We are steady trying to improve our service. Our third quarter report says that we've been passing our performance measures. And you know, at the end of the day, that is what counts. And we're very pleased about that. And we just want to finish that off on a high note. The Board is currently going through a management audit that's being funded by the City of Las Vegas. So our elected officials are very much engaged in assessing where the Board is now. We are definitely in transition. And finally, of course, the Board elections were held and Mr. Brewer was re-elected. I gave him a one-way ticket to New York but he made it back before the elections were held so he got re-elected. And I was elected Vice Chairman of which my mother was she here would be eternally grateful that I amounted to something. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and we'll entertain any questions that anyone may have.

**Chair:** Yes.

**Baez:** I have a comment, actually. I did attend the Arbor Employment event and we do thank you for your words, Mr. Chair, but you left early and you were not able to see the miracle that did occur. Reverend Richardson was given an award for all of his good works in the community and he was speechless. So, I know you would have like to have seen that. So I just wanted to comment. But, congratulations, it was very, very emotional. There wasn't a dry eye in the place. And I had no idea that this gentleman had given so much to this community.

**Chair:** Was the award the miracle? Or was it his being speechless a miracle?

**Baez:** All of the above.

**Chair:** I'm sure it was just his being speechless. Well, congratulations, Chester, that's very well deserved, for sure.

**Hendrickson:** Mr. Chair? I have a question of the Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Board. Our last meeting in March, on March the 10<sup>th</sup>, we had quite a long discussion about the \$1.1 million High Growth Initiative Grant. At that time, there were 326 referred, 283 graduates and 8 placed according to our minutes. I would just like to have an update of that, if possible.

**Galbreth:** If I could have the staff to come and speak to that. With your indulgence, Mr. Chairman.

**Chair:** Sure. Certainly. Good question and I look forward to the answer.

**Blue:** Thank you. Thank you very much. Richard Blue, Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Board. I'll give you a report dated as of June the 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006. At that time, the total number of graduates was reflected at 248. 23 hired at Stations Casino. 8 hired at Venetian. 1 at Luxor. 2 at MGM. 30 at various locations.

**Galbreth:** Mr. Chair Also, what we feel was really impressive about the grant is that all the graduates of this particular initiative, they received over 90% score with their graduation. I mean, that really is impressive. Kudos go to the community college because very, very successful.

**Blue:** And as of Monday, they begin their Phase 2, which is the trainer component.

**Galbreth:** Which is part of the incumbent worker. They train in order to do a cascade effect. In order to get current employees in the Station Casinos area to train all of those that are coming up through the process.

**Chair:** Any other questions for the Southern Board? Thanks, gentlemen. Very good.

### **Agenda Item VIII. – Governor's Workforce Investment Board Committee Reports**

**Chair:** There's no committee report on the Reserve Funds Budget Committee. And Marketing Committee, Mr. Richard Lee.

**Lee:** Chairman, it's good to be here. Also, I am happy to report that the English Version of the Nevada JobConnect Business and Job Seekers tri-fold brochure is at the printer. And it'll be done any day now. Hallelujah. We're all real excited to have that done. Also, the Spanish Version is completed and it'll be at the printer in the next week or two. So we'll have both those out. From the local board, to get those, the brochures will be stored at DETR's stockroom in Carson City. Tami will notify all of the offices when they arrive and provide instructions on how to go about ordering them. In addition to the brochures, we're pretty close to having the business cards done. The infamous business card is going to make it, come hell or high water. Tami has just completed the modification paperwork to extend BBC's advertising contract through September. We used the portioned of the original filing to allocate and redistribute it to allow BBC to assist in a new website design. Their bringing a new website expert to help them. So we're going to see a redesign of the JobConnect website which we think is pretty important. Our world seems to be centered around, as you very well know, Mr. Chair, around the Internet and applying for jobs on the Internet. And we need to bring ours into state of the art. With the limited budget that we have, I'm sure we're going to have something that's going to be pretty exciting. It will be similar in nature when you see the tri-fold. It will have that recognizable look to it. I'm kind of excited to get this under way. It seems like we struggled to get through the brochure and now we're going to take all that we've learned and try to get this website up and going. We hope to launch it towards the end of the summer, early fall at the latest. That's our report. Thank you.

**Chair:** Thank you very much, Richard. Any questions?

**Richardson:** Mr. Chairman, Am I to understand that all of this buildup on the marketing and we're getting a couple of brochures and ...

**Chair:** No, we're getting business cards.

**Richardson:** Oh. I feel complete now.

**Lee:** No, I'd love to answer that. He sensed probably some frustration that I sense too. Getting through the bureaucracy of trying to get . . . We hired the new marketing company. And our job was to get this brochure out. And it took a lot longer to get the brochure than I would have liked to get the brochure. It seems like we stumbled trying to get into some of the things that are more important working with the investment boards. It doesn't seem like it's all that big a deal. But, at least it's giving some direction from which we can then branch off. It's kind of like, okay, here's the direction, here's the design of the direction. Now let's take this and use this model and branch into all the other things we want to do.

**Chair:** It's okay, Richard.

**Lee:** Okay.

**Richardson:** So no PSAs, no campaigns. No job fairs. No, I mean, I thought there was going to be, based on the relationship of what was relayed to us months ago, that there was going to be some plan and we were going to, the local consortium was going to have an opportunity to review it and to give input. Alright, I'm through. No, no, that's okay.

**Chair:** I want to get the answer to the question.

**Lee:** We do have members from the local boards meeting with us and I welcome their input every time. I'm not quite sure what you're asking. Now are you asking for what we're doing with public relations and how that's going? And what BBC's doing with public relations? What's your question?

**Chair:** Well, I think Chester's question is probably the same as all of ours. Which is, a general frustration related to marketing. We all agreed years ago that one of the best things we could do here is market ourselves. And I just think that there, I don't know, maybe it's just government work that there's not as much marketing as there is in the private sector. It's hard to say. It's not an easy process. And I'm sure it's as frustrating for you as it is for every one of us. I'd like to take this offline and at the next meeting, I'd like an agenda item which is, I'd like to spend a great deal of time on marketing the next time because we haven't done it in several years. And Chester raises a very good point. It's unclear where and how we should go in this. And I think we should take more time. And Richard, I'd like to get a full briefing from you at that meeting. Kind of a let's see what we have and let's see the brochures and where the sense of the Board is where we might want to go. Because this is your first year in this and several of us have too many years in this. And we'd like to focus on this again. Because getting the word out is what we're all about. And having results. So I think Chester's point is well made. And I'd like to make this a main agenda item. We always pick one, it seems, in these meetings. So I'd like to do that for the next meeting. If that's okay with the Board.

**Nash:** Mr. Chair? Mr. Chair, this is Tami. I just wanted to remind the Board that in the past, the marketing contracts have been upwards between \$400,000 and \$500,000. The current contract is only \$100,000 and to do TV spots or anything of that magnitude would require additional funding. It's just not possible with just \$100,000.

**Chair:** Well, I think we need to just look at what monies we want to allocate. I mean these always come out of the reserve funds.

**Nash:** Absolutely.

**Chair:** Producing them isn't. Usually. But let's talk about it at the next meeting. I think you're making a good point, Chester, and I'd like to just ratchet this up to a major Board discussion. And it's one that's probably overdue.

**Baez:** Mr. Chair? That was going to be my comment. And also that was part of my question before. About what the local boards do to market. Because in my three-year tenure, that's probably been something that's been frustrating because I don't know what they're doing. And then I know what we're doing. And, um, I thought that if we can bring this up with all of us . . . For example, if we're ordering ad specialty items in the North and then we're ordering some in the South, perhaps we could get together and buy them together and get a discount. But if we all don't know what each other's doing, how can we do that? So thank you.

**Chair:** Well, I think it's a good discussion to have. So I'd like to just encourage that. And I know Richard is good at this and I'd like to just support him with a discussion and some Board decisions and direction. Any other comments for the marketing? Let's see. Mary-Ann Brown, the Youth Council.

**Brown:** In your packet are some photographs taken from the conference, which was a great success. I thank Chester for his kind words already. Some pictures from the two-day conference. And then I also am hopeful that Tami, who's amazing, managed to get the video clips for us to look at from the news media coverage. We actually had all four stations there and that might give you a flavor of the conference.

**Nash:** I did. Are you ready for them to roll that?

**Brown:** Sure, that'd be great.

**Nash:** Okay. Just one moment.

**Brown:** Audio visual.

**Chair:** Wow, we've come a long way.

*(Videotape is played)*

**Brown:** As you can tell, the intent of the conference was two-fold. One was to gather providers, both at the government and the private, non-profit sector, that relate to youth and youth employment, and particularly dealing with at-risk youth., the most at-risk youth, which is really the emphasis of both the local boards and us as a state board. So, the idea was to gather youth providers together to do networking, figure out what everyone's doing, get to know what's happening across the state and also generate some enthusiasm and a sense of wanting to do more cutting edge kinds of programming and reaching out again, to these very at-risk youth. So that was the overall intent of the conference. So it was a great success. We had a really good turnout. It was by invitation only. And we actually had people who wanted to come who we weren't able to allow participating because of our funding issues. But we had a full turnout. We managed to come in under budget, although I will say we were awarded \$30,000 from various entities. We were able to add to that by some of our very supportive partners and Mike Willden being one of those helpful committee members that helped us get some additional funding. So there are some pictures in your book. There are also some statistical breakdown of individuals that attended and then evaluations. And particularly in the evaluations, as you read them, you will note some of the remarkable comments made by the youth and you can tell by some of the language and the descriptions they used of their two-day experience. The kids stayed at the Hilton. We did after-conference activities. We had a conference call yesterday, no earlier in the week where we did some analysis of successes and challenges in putting on the conference. But overall, I think it was a remarkable experience for those who attended and I think it will lead to some real innovative, creative and sort of momentum. I'm glad to hear about what Las Vegas is doing with the information they gained and there's also some momentum amongst providers and those in government agencies who were able to attend the conference. Along with thanking Mike Willden, I also absolutely need to

thank Tami Nash. She was exceptionally hard working along with the rest of the sub-committee, and one of my staff members in particular, Pam Becker, who helped. Tami even elicited her son to help stuff bags, etc. So, the conference itself went very smoothly because there were a lot of people who worked very hard.

**Chair:** Thank you very much. Any comments?

**Forbes:** Mr. Chairman, Lee Forbes. Just to follow up on Mary-Ann's report, I wanted to express my gratitude to you for being such a busy individual. You weren't able to go and speak and they asked me to speak on your behalf. It was a lot of fun. Very, very high energy. Mary-Ann and Tami and their whole team definitely hit a home run. And it was a real pleasure to participate in that on your behalf. The food was also very good.

**Chair:** The story of my life, missing the good food.

**Chair:** But thanks, Lee for sitting in for me. I appreciate it. Any other comments?

**Hendrickson:** Mr. Chair? This is Sidney Hendrickson. I've been on this board in various capacities for many years and reading through the binders, I think seventeen years you've been stating, my favorite part of my entire tenure here is I am worth something in this world. And kudos to the committee that put this together. This is why this Board sits here--to make youth feel like they have a place to belong. And I appreciate that.

**Brown:** I just, one response to that would be, when I first chaired this committee, there were a lot of people who said, you can't do this. You won't find the money. People don't want to do it. It's impossible to do. And I will tell you that a small group of committed individuals with passion can achieve amazing things and this was absolutely proof of that. So, thank you.

**Weber:** Mr. Chairman, would you tell me the amount or the percentage of youth that came from other than Northern Nevada. Whether it was rural and Southern Nevada and do you plan to do it again?

**Brown:** We have statistical data. I don't know if we included in this summary. We have that because we have an attendance sheet. And we targeted individuals from across the state. We had percentages that we wanted. And that was discussed at the committee level. And someone can remind me if they remember the exact percentages, but we included the rurals, the north and the south, and we each have percentages. Do you remember what percentages? And I think we achieved those for the most part.

**Galbreth:** Mr. Chair, I don't remember the specific exact percentages but most of them were from Southern Nevada and we also looked at the different types of categories. For example, youth who had parents that were ex-offenders. Those that were high risk in different areas. Foster care, youth with disabilities. So there was a cross section. In addition to the geographical areas within the state, but also in the different categories. We targeted youth that were in high risk, regardless to becoming successful in the workforce.

**Brown:** If you'd like that, I can send it to you. Okay.

**Chair:** Thank you.

**Dryden:** Mr. Chairman, Phyllis Dryden speaking. I would like to commend Mary and committee that put together this conference. I was there and I also want to add that the \$20,000 incentive money that the Department of Ed invested in this was well worth it.

**Nash:** Mr. Chair, this is Tami again. I also wanted to let you know that the State of Nevada did receive the incentive award again this year and they're putting together the budget and we have set aside funding for a youth conference yesterday, in the amount of about \$45,000.

**Chair:** Great, thank you.

**Richardson:** Mr. Chairman, again, I want to thank staff for the work they did to support this. Tami and Chuck Baldauskas. They did a tremendous job there.

**Brown:** One final thing for our Chairman, here. This was actually your fault, too. Because when you made me Chairman, you said my first day I get appointed to the Board, I get assigned the youth council. And you said, youth is our priority. And I want to see us do something so I took that very seriously.

**Chair:** Oh, I'm glad I'm to blame. Thank you. Good comments and a good conference. Thank you very much. Legislative Committee, Terry Johnson.

**Johnson:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, in the interests of time, there is a listing there of some activity taken by the Legislative Commission. While our Legislature obviously is not in session at this time, the Legislative Commission met to approve and review regulations that were proposed by various divisions in DETR. Employment Security Division, the Rehabilitation Division and the Equal Rights Commission. And those are just some of the highlights of the various regulatory proposals that were submitted by the DETR agencies, reviewed and approved by the Legislative Commission and are on their way to becoming into effect. At the national level, the Congress has not yet re-authorized the Workforce Investment Act. We're still awaiting their action on that. It appears improbable that this will happen in this Congressional session. But with that, I'll make myself available for any questions the Board might have.

**Chair:** No questions? We'll move on to the Training Account Work Group.

**Dryden:** Mr. Chairman, Phyllis Dryden for the record. I do not have a formal report but I'd like to make an informal comment. We're still live. Thank you. The ITA subgroup or work committee is still live. Any issues that come forth we do handle, but we haven't had any major concerns. We, of course, are waiting for the re-authorization of WIA. And when that occurs, then we will handle the things out of that Act that need to be worked with the Individual Training Account Workgroup. And that's all I have to say. We still exist. Thank you.

**Chair:** Thank you very much. Any questions for Phyllis? All right, moving on, let's see here. Nominating Committee. Tami are you filling in for Mark?

**Nash:** Yes, Mr. Chair. We currently still have two vacancies on the Board. Northern Nevada business and I'm begging anyone you can refer anybody our way for consideration, it would be much appreciated. These two positions have been vacant for coming up on two years and we are having difficulties getting a quorum for each Board meeting so it would be nice to have some additional members that we could rely on.

**Chair:** So I recommend we have these Board meetings in a local pub in Northern Nevada and we can probably recruit some people there if they think that's where the meetings are. Can I get any support for that? Yeah, I'll drink to that. These two have been open for awhile. But anyways, ask Mr. Fitzgoblin there if he knows anybody else and would like to nominate him.

**Nash:** And also, effective on October 31, '06, we have 14 of our Board members terms expiring.

**Chair:** Is mine?

**Nash:** No, sir. You still have another year. But I have inquired as to who would like . . .

**Chair:** Fourteen?

**Nash:** Fourteen.

**Chair:** How did that happen?

**Nash:** Well, when we first appointed the Board several years back, we didn't do a very good job of staggering the terms.

**Chair:** It'll be staggering if they all leave.

**Nash:** Yeah. So I've been working hard with the Governor's Office to make sure those terms are staggered.

**Chair:** No, they can't leave until they get replacements and we have an almost impossible time replacing any of you so you're all here until you get replaced.

**Nash:** Well, I've only heard from a handful that are interested.

**Chair:** We can put that in the bylaws, can't we?

**Baez:** Mr. Chairman? Debra Baez. About two months ago, I did put in my replacement nomination and that is in the works. And I keep meeting other people who might be interested but I'm personally not sure what to do with them. I don't want to waste people's time and get them all excited. So if there are people who are interested.

**Chair:** Forward them to Tami.

**Nash:** And there is information on the DETR website that talks about the process and to contact me.

**Baez:** Yes, I did see a deadline on there, though, that had passed. So I thought it was over.

**Nash:** It's updated now. It's extended to July 15<sup>th</sup>.

**Baez:** Thank you.

**Nash:** You're welcome.

**Chair:** The deadline is never over for this, believe me. Okay. Is that it, Tami? Frightening news.

**Nash:** That's it, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

**Chair:** Thank you very much. Let's see, as I said, Jean Peyton is off getting a replacement for Lander so she couldn't be with us. But we're going to meet the new Lander next time. And the Information Committee there's no report.

### **Agenda Item IX. – Staff Reports**

**Chair:** The staff reports on in your Board books and I encourage you to review them. The staff has been very competently working away. And I want to thank them.

### **Agenda Item X - Public Comments**

**Chair:** I'd like to go straight to the public comments section. And encourage any of the public, people who are attending these meetings. If anyone has a comment, please come forward now. All right. That's it?

### **Agenda Item XI - Next Meeting and Adjournment**

**Chair:** The next meeting is September 15<sup>th</sup>. It looks like the next meeting, Lee I want to put you on notice now, I will not be here. I will be lost in China on September 15<sup>th</sup>. And hopefully, I'll return sometime

at the end of September. I hope that you'll be able to carry on. And again, I want to recommend that we have that discussion on the marketing program here. Any other business or information to come before us. Any other comments? Do I have a motion to adjourn. Do I have a second? We have a motion and a second. All those in favor.

**Board:** Aye.

**Chair:** All opposed. Thank you, have a great summer, everyone.