

GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD MEETING
AKA State Workforce Investment Board (SWIB)
Thursday, June 14, 2012 – 1:00 p.m.
Grant Sawyer Building
555 E. Washington Street, Room #4401
Las Vegas, Nevada

Alternate Location: Some members of the Board may be attending the meeting and other persons may observe the meeting and provide testimony through a simultaneous videoconference conducted at the following location:

Legislative Building
401 S. Carson Street, Room #2135
Carson City, Nevada

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present: Richard Lee (Vice Chair), Jo Cato (by telephone), Pamela Egan (by telephone), Kathy Grost (by telephone), Eric James, Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick (by telephone), Maite Salazar, Frank Woodbeck and Bradley Woodring.

Absent: Mary-Ann Brown, Douglas Geinzer, Senator Ruben Kihuen, Senator Mark Manendo, Leslie Martin, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Dr. Maria Sheehan, and Geoffrey Wilson.

Also present: William Anderson, (DETR – Chief Economist Research and Analysis Bureau), Odalys Carmona (DETR), Mark Costa (CFO, DETR), Derrick Berry, (DETR), Debra Collins, (Workforce Connections), Venus Fajota, (DETR), Ardell Galbreth (Workforce Connections, Interim Executive Director), Lynn Houghton (Community Services Agency), LeVerne W. Kelley (DETR), Earl McDowell, (DETR – Deputy Administrator, Workforce Solutions Unit), Tamara Nash (State Board Liaison, DETR), Mr. Grant Nielson (DETR – Workforce Investment Support Services Unit, Employment Security Division, Renee Olson, (DETR – Employment Security Development Administrator), Michael Pennington (Community Services Agency), Dennis Perea (DETR, Deputy Director), Bob Potts (Governor's Office of Economic Development), John Thurman (Nevadaworks), Kris Wells (Nevadaworks), Beth Wicks (Nevadaworks), Linda Yi, (Nevada HC Sector Council).

- I. WELCOME** – Vice Chair Richard Lee called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. **Vice Chair Lee asked that the Agenda be approved. Moved by Frank Woodbeck. Seconded by Bradley Woodring. The motion was approved.**
- II. ROLL CALL AND CONFIRMATION OF QUORUM** – Vice Chair Lee stated there was no quorum at the beginning of the meeting and so items were heard out of order. He began with reports from Local Workforce Investment Board Reports, Item VII.
- III. VERIFICATION OF POSTING** – Tamara Nash verified the meeting was posted in accordance with Nevada's Open Meeting Law.
- IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS** – Vice Chair Lee asked if there were any public comments from northern Nevada or southern Nevada. There were none.
- V. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 26, 2012 MEETING MINUTES** – **It was moved, seconded and carried to approve the April 26, 2012 Meeting Minutes.**

Vice Chair Lee requested confirmation from Ms. Nash that he had a quorum. He said that Pamela Egan had left but left instructions to be contacted by phone if needed. He noted that Member Jo Cato and Member Kathy Grost were on the phone. Member Cato confirmed she was on the phone. Member Grost confirmed that she was on the phone. Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick confirmed she was on the phone. Ms. Nash confirmed they had a quorum.

VI. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF NEVADA'S INTEGRATED WORKFORCE PLAN FOR TITLE 1 OF THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1998, WAGNER PEYSER ACT AND AGRICULTURAL OUTREACH

Frank Woodbeck, Director of Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation, (DETR)

He stated that he wanted to review the consolidation plan for workforce investment in the state and he noted that it was included in the packet. He acknowledged that Interim Director Galbreth had done an excellent job since he took over in early April 2012. He stated that he himself had come on board as director of DETR in October of 2011. He noted that prior to that there had been a number of years in which the audits and performances of the northern and southern Workforce Investment Boards had been reviewed on an ongoing basis and in the past three years at least, the audits had been for both boards but with more emphasis on the southern Board. He said late in 2011 the Governor had directed the audit team to perform an audit on both Boards regarding expenditures. He said it was in response to a series of audits where in that three-year period there were negative audit findings on the program side, particularly for the southern Board. After a review and deliberation and taking into consideration the fact that the northern Board lost its executive director and the southern Board might have lost its executive director at that time it was decided at that specific time that they should look at and consider a consolidation plan. He continued that it was after long deliberation and a consideration of the history of the facts that the decision was reached.

He continued and said that at the 2009 Legislature the Economic Development Office in the Nevada was transformed into the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED) and the structure was reformed. He noted that research was done in which seven industry sectors were identified as being those in which Nevada would grow the economy going forward. He stated that the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) called for collaboration between workforce development, economic development and higher education to move the economy forward with the goal of developing the workforce of the future. He continued that in addition to collaboration there was a need for transparency. He stated that they needed to find a way in which if consolidation took place there would be input into whatever plans there were for the training of that workforce. He noted that with those objectives in mind they looked at the strategic plan for workforce development, the economic development plan (including dealing with the economic boom and bust cycles), and the strengths of the state such as clean energy, aerospace, defense, health services, and business information systems. He stated the goals of the governor were a balanced resilient statewide economy based on: economic opportunities; innovation; hard work and collaboration; a smaller and efficient state government and education system; and a flexible and effective workforce investment system.

He referred to the leisure and hospitality industry and mining and noted that mining industry was the economic engine of many Nevada rural economies and those economies had unemployment rates in low single digits. He stated that the construction industry after the boom of 2004-2005 collapsed. He noted that the construction industry comprised 12% of the workforce at its highest point as opposed to the average of approximately 5% in other states. He stated that the state needed to look for ways that people previously employed in construction could be retrained or cross-trained in new disciplines. He said there were some projected growth industries that were identified and he acknowledged that they needed to take advantage of or fill the projected skill gaps identified for those particular workers. He stated that companies would ask two questions when they considered coming to Nevada, the first concerned what incentives they could get for starting their business in the state and the second would be was there a qualified workforce to support the business. He confirmed that they were in lockstep with GOED in trying to do that.

He noted that the current structure was comprised of two local workforce investment areas, one in the north and one in the south and state level government was by the Governor's Workforce Investment Board (GWIB) and administrative oversight and support would come from DETR. He said the status of the workforce investment system currently was high-level administrative cost at the board level, administrative costs for operating the boards and an oversight of program services administered by the boards. He noted that those costs, depending on which measure you would take, could run from 26% - 32% of the funding from the federal government. He added that they felt that percentage could be reduced. He noted that after reviewing this they found they could push, (prior to Director Galbreth's changes in their expense structure), about \$5 to \$6 million in additional funds that they could push into training and service delivery in the workforce investment areas.

He said that the structure of the plan was that they would not change the workforce investment areas and the current allocation to those areas. He said the administration of the training and service delivery would come to the GWIB with administrative support formed by DETR. He continued and stated that the current staffing levels prior to the changes were approximately 72 employees of Workforce Connections in the south and approximately 11 at Nevadaworks in the north. He stated they had devised a plan under which the structure of DETR would expand by 18 employees. He added they would have a contract and compliance area and a program monitoring area under two separate deputy directors which they felt would maintain the integrity of the two units. He said the expenses for administration would be reduced from approximately \$7 million statewide to approximately \$1.9 million. He referred to the timing and noted that these current changes had

occurred against a backdrop of certain circumstances as previously noted and these included the fact that neither board had current permanent directors and in view of what had occurred over the past several years. He acknowledged there had been positive changes recently in the south but the main point was that they could eliminate a number of administrative and program oversight costs by consolidation. He said federal funding was not increasing but remaining flat at best and they needed to find ways to collaborate and put more dollars into training and service delivery.

He referred to the issue of local input and noted that the 2009 legislature asked DETR to establish sector councils for each of the industries involved in economic development. He said at that time they were concentrating on three sectors but since then they had identified seven sectors and seven industry sector councils had come into play. He said each council would number between 20 to 25 people and 51% of the members would come from the private sector and at least 3 of the public sector members would be local elected officials, one from a northern urban area which would be Washoe, one from the south which would be Clark and one from a rural county and this would mean input from each geographic sector of each sector council. He referred to one of the councils, Mining, Materials and Manufacturing and commented that this was in fact two distinct industries and noted that he was considering splitting it and establishing an eighth sector council which would result in additional local input. He referred again to the importance of industry intelligence coming from professionals in the field in determining what was needed to have a qualified and trained workforce and to identify emerging careers. He said that information would go directly to the GWIB which would then act and instruct DETR to establish service and training mechanisms in those areas. He stated that each sector council would have a member of the Senate or a member of the Assembly, three local elected officials, an executive from one of the community colleges, an executive from the Office of Higher Education, a representative of K through 12, the GOED sector specialist and an economist from the Research and Analysis Division. He referred to the issue of youth, brought up at the last meeting and noted that they would have a liaison from DETR's Workforce Solutions Unit assigned specifically to youth initiatives and he added that would be Odalys Carmona assigned to that role and she would report to the GWIB and would work with each of the sector councils.

Mr. Eric James noted that he had had a chance to speak with Ms. Carmona and that she had some excellent ideas concerning the youth initiatives with the councils. He asked whether the whole plan was still contingent on the federal government approving the governor's waiver. Member Frank Woodbeck responded that was correct. Mr. James asked would that happen later in 2012 or did they have a timeframe on when that would occur. Member Woodbeck responded that the plan would be submitted to the Department of Labor (DOL) on July 1, 2012 and there was a draft review period until September and then they would have 90 days after which they would declare it as no longer being a draft or a formal submission to approve or disapprove, therefore during the last quarter of 2012. Mr. James noted that if it was not approved was there a backup plan or an appeal process. Member Woodbeck responded that it was his responsibility to develop the best delivery mechanism for training services so he would appeal it if they were turned down. He noted that they were also operating on a parallel path in which they were cooperating with Interim Director Galbreth but that would also be based on the office compliance policies that would be put in place regarding expenditure caps etcetera for the boards. Mr. James asked whether the jobs coming from Mr. Galbreth's agency would be absorbed under DETR or would it be an open employment enrollment. He asked if he could comment on the transition, so the 18 additional jobs going into DETR would they be coming from Workforce Connections or were they coming from outside. He asked how those jobs were being filled and were they being absorbed from the two sectors. Member Woodbeck responded there would not be a direct absorption. He said that they hoped they would have some of the employees for employment at DETR in various positions but they did have an open application policy they would follow.

Vice Chair Lee requested confirmation from Ms. Nash that he had a quorum. He said that Pamela Egan had left but had left instructions to be contacted by phone if needed. He noted that Member Jo Cato and Member Kathy Grost were on the phone. Member Cato confirmed she was on the phone. Member Grost confirmed that she was on the phone. Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick confirmed she was on the phone. Ms. Nash confirmed they had a quorum.

Vice Chair Lee stated that they were talking about Nevada's Integrated Workforce Plan for Title 1 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, Wagner Peyser Act and Agricultural Outreach. He stated they would be asking for a vote and if it was not unanimous then they would ask that each member of the quorum to identify themselves and reveal how they had voted.

Vice Chair Lee moved to approve the action and took a vote. All members approved and no one opposed. The motion was approved.

VII. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT STATE COMPLIANCE POLICIES

- a. 1.6 – Eligibility for Adult and Dislocated Worker Employment and Training Activities

b. 3.6 – Cost Limitations

Dennis Perea, Deputy Director, DETR

Mr. Perea indicated they were asking for approval for only State Compliance Policy 1.6 – Eligibility for Adult and Dislocated Worker Employment and Training Activities. He stated that 3.6 – Cost Limitations was pulled for consideration. He referred to Policy 1.6 and referred members to their packet and stated that the change was as a result of a training and employment guidance letter from the DOL to change the selective service qualifications for people who would be eligible for the program. He stated that to be eligible for any federal program you would have had to be qualified for selective service or perform selective service registration. He stated that due to the change brought about because of the guidance letter they would not have to have written documentation in the file stating that there was a willful compliance not to register for that and he stated they had changed the policy as such. He explained in further detail why policy 3.6 was pulled.

Vice Chair Lee stated they would have a possible action on 1.6 Eligibility for Adult and Dislocated Worker Employment and Training Activities. Moved by Eric James. Seconded by Maite Salazar. A vote was taken and the motion was approved.

VIII. LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD REPORTS

a. **Nevadaworks** – Bradley Woodring, Chair

He noted that Nevadaworks review groups made up of board members for the RFP process during the week of April 16th ranked the 60 proposals that came in. He noted that the recommendations were presented to the board for approval on June 8th and were subsequently approved. He stated that they were currently in the midst of a financial audit from DETR, the Workforce Investment Support Services (WISS) group. He said that the audit was being performed by a firm in Reno. He said they were excited about the work being done in all areas of the contract and performance. He provided some details: adult interim employment which was 90.18%; adult employment retention 106.72%; adult average earnings 111.53%; dislocated workers entering employment 94.7%; dislocated workers employment retention 102.87%; and dislocated workers average earnings 111.45%. In the youth programs he gave the following details: the attainment for degree or certificate 177.46%; youth placement in employment or post-secondary education 160.34%; and in the youth literacy/numeracy program 127.71%. He noted that the invested funds were showing great success in the programs. He added that the percentages would be part of adding wage information for clients working in states other than Nevada.

He noted that Nevadaworks announced the end of two services in northern Nevada. One of these was Nevada Rural Liaisons and the program It's About Jobs. He referred to Nevada Rural Liaisons and noted it had been developed 18 months ago by Tom Fitzgerald and staff and they had worked hard in the rural areas taking the message of the Department of Labor (DOL) opportunities and Nevadaworks funding out to participants, economic development, local governments and other contractors. He discussed the It's About Jobs, initiative begun about two years before and had run its full course on the contract which ended on June 1, 2012. He said that in the report there was additional commentary on the Nevada Rural Liaisons and It's About Jobs. He added that Nevadaworks had had its board meeting June 8, 2012. He said that during the previous GWIB meeting he had reported that Tom Fitzgerald had left as CEO of Nevadaworks and they had placed Mr. John Thurman as Interim CEO. He said he was pleased to say that the board had now made that permanent and Mr. Thurman was the CEO and he welcomed him to Nevadaworks.

Mr. Woodring announced that he would be leaving as the Board Chair as of July 1, 2012 and Ms. Kris Wells with AT&T would be assuming that position for the next two years. He stated that Nevadaworks would be in good hands with her.

b. **Workforce Connections** – Ardell Galbreth, Interim Executive Director

He began by asking Debra Collins and Linda Yi to join him because he wanted them both to share some of the things they had done with respect to the healthcare sector.

He acknowledged that the report submitted was substantial and he encouraged the board to read it but said he would be reviewing it and would be brief. He noted that Workforce Connections had been operating and overseeing a prison re-entry project for quite some time. He said the project for in-house support would end at June 30, 2012. He noted that they had reviewed their publishing process (RFP) and had selected the provider to deliver those goods and services and that was included in the report. He began comments on the Green Economy in partnership with the State Energy Sector Partnership Grant. He noted that it affected manufacturing, gaming, tourism, businesses, ecosystems and logistics operations. He added they were pleased with the way that particular program was progressing. He discussed the Adult & Dislocated Worker Partner Programs and the programs for youth. He said that funds awarded for youth had amounted to more \$4.8 million for the upcoming program year beginning July 1, 2012. He referred to the report and noted that \$1.9

million for Adult & Dislocated Worker contracts would greatly assist the men and woman of southern Nevada with respect to employment and training services.

Although not in the report he noted that Workforce Connections had ‘hit it on all cylinders’ with performance in all areas from adults, dislocated workers and youth. He said that with the support they were received from their funded partners or service providers they would continue to meet or exceed the numbers indicated in the handout. He brought to the attention of the members a document in the packet which was an announcement of the Workforce Connections two-year compliance plan. He elaborated and said that the compliance plan was aligned with the Governor’s Workforce Plan with one exception and that was they did not concur with the one Statewide Board Initiative. He indicated that he wanted to read into the record a brief synopsis regarding the position of the Chief Elected Officials Consortium in southern Nevada. He stated that subsequent to his brief comments Debra Collins and Linda Yi would give a review of the position of the Heath Care Sector Council. Mr. Galbreth gave his synopsis of remarks previously given during the public comment:

“The State Plan has many excellent initiatives of which Workforce Connections and the Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Area chief elected officials embrace. However with considerable thought and all due respect to the Governor and the state officials the Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Area Chief Local Elected Officials Consortium strongly opposes the State Plan to establish a single consolidated Workforce Investment Board to oversee and to deliver statewide workforce development services. We certainly appreciate the opportunity to respond to the State of Nevada’s Workforce Plan for Title 1 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, Wagner Peyser Act and Agricultural Outreach. We look forward, very much so, to working with any and all partners and stakeholders in overseeing the development and the delivery of quality employment and training services in the State of Nevada and this is respectfully on behalf of Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Area, Chief Elected Officials Consortium. He noted his name was indicated and he served as the Interim Executive Director.”

Workforce Connections –Linda Yi, Project Director, Nevada Health Care Sector Council

She noted that the council was meeting on a monthly basis and had made excellent progress with its activities. She commented that bylaws for all the sector councils had been established and distributed to the councils. She added that based on that they had established their subcommittees in reference to the bylaws. She stated therefore that they would be having subcommittees in the following areas: education and training; grants and resources; economic development; data evaluation and research; legislation; and special projects. She noted that based on that what had been established was that jobs in health information technology had been identified as one of the ‘up and coming’ types of jobs that Nevada would need. She stated that they had formed that subcommittee on grants and resources, chaired by Lynn O’Mara, the State Director for Health Information Technology. She stated that the sector councils were supposed to be providing industry intelligence for money moving forward and one of their first activities was to establish the subcommittee looking at what the criteria would be if money was available for an RFP for health information technology. She stated that they had approximately 20 members including members of the public who participated and the information had been forwarded to the Mr. Frank Woodbeck. She mentioned that Mr. Vance Farrow, the industry specialist, from (GOED) joined them at their first meeting and set the tone providing some welcome ideas for the sector council to move forward. She discussed several of the members of the council and their new initiatives. She added that she and Debra Collins were invited to Washington, D.C. May 14-17, 2012 to attend the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Health Resource and Services Administration Best Practices in State Health Care Workforce Data and Planning Conference. She commented it was a good meeting and she noted that it was good to see Nevada recognized for the good work done by Dr. John Packham.

Workforce Connections – Debra Collins

She referred to the GWIB meeting on May 23, 2012 during which she advised that the Workforce Connections Nevada Hospital Association and the Nevada Institute of Nurses intended to host an Operation Health Care Bound. She commented that they had 125 youths who had participated in the event and 12 hospitals. She described some of the activities in which the participants took part including: a lunch with the doctors; robotic surgery; viewing live operations; births; visited and took part in experiments in the pharmacy; practiced CPR; viewed equipment at the hospitals; visited amputees at extended care facilities and learned about physical therapy. She added that they tried to make areas normally not accessible available to them. She made comments regarding the strong interest expressed by youth in attending similar future events. She noted that they had a video which they would be providing to Ms. Tamara Nash for distribution to board members.

Member Cato referred to the last meeting in which she had asked for specifics as to what they could do to bring southern Nevada on board with the statewide plan. She noted that Mr. Galbreth was the Interim Executive Director and acknowledged that he had done a great job. She expressed her concern and stated that in 2005 there were some problems, in that the money was not going out and they were not moving forward, however the Legislature had submitted some

bills and there seemed to be some movement and improvement. She continued that all product was brought in-house as opposed to projects being sent to the non-profits. She added that in 2011 people said it was moving forward but she disagreed and thought it was not. She said now the Legislature and the Governor's office were trying to say let's do this and southern Nevada was opposed. She noted she had spoken to some of those elected officials. She asked Mr. Galbreth what the elected officials had to say at the public meeting. Mr. Galbreth responded that during the meeting they all voted to oppose the statewide single board plan with the exception of one. He continued there were several reasons given and these included: they wanted local control; and there was some concern as to whether southern Nevada would receive the same support as they currently were receiving. He gave as an example the fact that southern Nevada receives 70-75% of the resources and there was concern as to whether that would remain the same and in addition the local elected officials felt the further away the resources were from the point of services the support and infrastructure would not be maintained in the local area.

Member Cato expressed a strong concern and stated that the funding needed to get out into the community. She stated that the statement concerning the origin of resources and point of providing services did not make sense to her. She said that southern Nevada would not lose any funding based on the formula that was in place by the federal government. She acknowledged his points but stressed that they could not be a lone organization in southern Nevada that did not work with the rest of the state. She made the point that southern Nevada would be left with the organization but with no funding which would not be helpful. She said as far as Workforce Connections was concerned she did not begrudge what they were trying to do but not every young person had similar opportunities. She wanted to know how to get everyone on board. She said the legislators were in place to ensure that southern Nevada would receive its fair share of dollars but she did not understand why Workforce Connections was the sole entity that did not want to proceed. Mr. Galbreth responded that at least 80% of the funds that they received for workforce investment and support services were allocated to community resource. He said they had reduced their staff by 54% and with regard to moving forward they had in planning stage the opening of a one-stop service center. He referred to their package and noted the details were included. He referred to the audits and said that in the reports they had reported to their board every month the status of each audit finding and most would disappear although he noted the benefits on ongoing audits. Member Cato asked about the long term and asked if they had put a policy procedure book in place so that changes would take effect and would not depend on who was in charge. She noted they had made changes two years ago and now they were back to the same place. Mr. Galbreth said the policy and two-year plan previously mentioned was in place. He said the local elected official had provided signature assurances that those policies would be maintained. He offered to meet with Member Cato and address some of her concerns.

Member Bradley Woodring as Chairman of Nevadaworks commented that both the council for Nevadaworks as well as the elected officials' council was both writing letters in support of the plan. He stated that they could see the validity of it moving forward. He noted and understood Mr. Galbreth's comments regarding the 70-75% resources that they received. However he reminded him that in the north with 25% of the dollars, the success that they had had throughout the 13 counties they served, geographically relying on the contractors in the rural areas to perform the training they received funding for, and they had been very successful. He said that rather than thinking about control of the dollars they viewed it more as an opportunity to work well and effectively together. He thought that perhaps the elected officials in the south might take it as an example of how everyone can work successfully together. Mr. Galbreth noted that their elected officials would agree with Mr. Woodring's comments and this was reiterated during the public comments. He said as far as collaborations or partnerships with the state, DETR and other agencies they were in agreement but the only issue was the statewide board initiative. He noted they intended to work hard with all their stakeholders to ensure that every area within the Workforce community would be served to the best of their ability.

IX. GOVERNOR'S WORKFOCE INVESTMENT BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS:

a. Workforce Planning, Policy, and Performance Committee, Mary Ann Brown, Chair

Vice Chair Lee noted that Member Mary-Anne Brown was not in attendance. He noted that she was recommending that the committee be dissolved and reformatted if there was a need for it in the future. He said she was proposing this but no action would be taken at the current meeting. He asked that Ms. Nash arrange that and they could address the issue in the future. Ms. Nash confirmed this.

b. Youth Council, Eric James, Chair

Mr. James confirmed that the Youth Council met in late May 2012 and they had an informative meeting. He said it was their one-year anniversary of their employment and training website for youth which was overseen by Arsenal Inc. He commented that they requested a one-year assessment to track outcomes from the outset in the fall of 2011 and said they would provide that information for the summer meeting. He said that this would help them plan and strategize going into the fall school semester. He said they wanted to see the results and how they could improve for the upcoming year. He

noted that they had received a detailed report from the Clark County School District and added they were in transition as their superintendent was leaving. He said that they had one of their representatives come to speak to them concerning what had and had not worked in northern Nevada as far as youth was concerned. He said they had added a representative from the Washoe County School District so they could get broader insight and additional transparency. He said that they had also requested that a Clark County representative join as well. He indicated a wish to work more closely with the statewide youth council to avoid overlapping agendas. He said they were working on a plan to improve this situation.

X. STAFF REPORTS

a. **Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Analysis of Expenditures** – Mark Costa, CFO, DETR

He indicated that they would find in their packets the standard Workforce Investment Act grant expenditure analysis as of April 30, 2012. He said the report was modified somewhat. He said that the totals in the left hand side of the report now consisted of Policy Year 11, Policy Year 10 and Policy Year 9. He said they had removed earlier years that had expired. He said for Policy Year 9 they were still showing \$106,183.40 left for that year but they anticipated that that amount had already be expended. He said Policy Year 9 would be closed out at the end of June 2012. He said Policy Year 12 was not included and did not have any expenditures.

b. **WIA Performance Measures/Levels** – Grant Nielson, Chief, Workforce Investment Support Services Unit, Employment Security Division/DETR

He noted that there was no report in the packets. He explained at the last meeting they did the quarterly reports and since there was a short time frame between meetings there were no updates.

XI. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Vice Chair Lee asked if there were any public comments. There were no public comments from the north or the south.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT – Vice Chair Lee confirmed the next meeting was scheduled for September 13, 2012. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.