

**TCWIB**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**June 9, 2011, EMDC 8:15am – 10:45am**

**Meeting Attendees:**

Tom Hart  
Joanna Russell  
Dan Tremble  
Michael Aube  
Julie Johnston  
Jon Symonds  
Lisa Rancourt  
Kevin Barbee  
Kerry Sack  
Mark Awalt  
Ken Proctor  
Rick Schweikert  
Chuck Rohn  
Dick Hansen  
Kerrie Tripp  
Leslie Brigham  
Scott Cates  
Jon Farley

Gordon Stitham  
Jane Searles  
Jack McKay  
Scott Cuddy  
Jeff Morin  
Charlie Newton  
Andy Fitzpatrick  
Shelly Reilly  
Jen Brooks  
Rick Holden (member of the public visitor)

On the TCWIB Phone:  
Steve Pound  
Andrea Bickford  
Steve Lambert  
Larry Barrett

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Welcome by Dan Tremble TCWIB Vice Chair. Group introductions followed.

**2. Conflict of Interest Procedure**

Dan Tremble requested a show of hands from anyone who may have a conflict of interest and further please disclose any conflict prior to moving forward with agenda items. There were no conflicts of interest.

**3. Meeting Minutes**

*Motion by Julie Johnston: Seconded by Kerrie Tripp, to approve the March 10, 2011 meeting minutes. Approved.*

**4. Director's Report**

Joanna Russell gave a brief update to the TCWIB regarding the following:  
(See attachment A - Board Activity)

- **ETA USDOL**

EMDC senior management, TCWIB director, TCWIB Chair (telephone), Vice Chair (telephone), Steve Duval, Division Director, Policy and Evaluation for MDOL/BES (telephone) met with ETA USDOL Regional I Administrator Holly O'Brien and her staff in Boston on May 18, 2011. The goal was to discuss and share information about the new EMDC workforce model. We extended an invitation to Holly O'Brien, USDOL Region I Director and Ms. Rodriguez (monitor for the state of Maine) to visit the Bangor area. They plan to arrive June 27, 2011 at approximately 5pm, staying until 3pm on June 28, 2011. Joanna sent a tentative agenda to them to review and they asked for a small meeting on the 27th with the TCWIB Chair and Vice Chair, Finance Committee Chair, EMDC Senior Management and TCWIB Executive Director.

**Tentative Meet and Greet: evening of June 27, 2011- Location TBD and Executive Director, will keep us informed of any updates.**

## **5. Finance Committee Report**

The TCWIB Finance Committee Chair reported on how the WIA federal funds are allocated. When the money comes into the state, the state normally receives 15% of the full allocation, 10% of those funds are dedicated to statewide activities and 5% state administration. This year the Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 2010 reduced those formula grant funds the Governors may reserve for statewide activities by 10 percentage points, from 15 percent to 5 percent. The state is unclear about the wording in the Act and is holding a portion of the 10% funding until they receive more information on how to utilize these funds. There is a possibility of the remaining 10% being sent out to the local areas.

ARRA funds not spent are reallocated back and a lot of the folks enrolled in the ARRA program will still be in the programming at the end of June 2011, and will be co-enrolled into the WIA formula programs.

Budget allocations with percentages were distributed.

Attachments provided PY2010 Budget plans, carry-in and new PY11 budget plans with summary.

(See attachment B-WIA Allocation and attachment C-Draft PY 2011 Planned Budget)

- **PY 2011 Planned Budget (July 1, 2011 – July 1, 2012) Draft**

Based on the WIA allocations discussed above, \$2,247,632 is a *projected* total budget including carry in (unused dollars carried over) and of that, Participant Training is \$689,985 and Participant Support Services is \$154,430.

- **ARRA**

Exceeded plans for Adult and Dislocated Workers. The Youth program will be fully expended by the end of June and projections. Any unspent ARRA funds will be returned to the federal government at the end of June 2011.

- **NEG (National Emergency Grants)**

Funds can only be used to serve workers laid-off from the affected company and are not transferable to other unemployed workers.

- Katahdin - has been fully expended.
- True Textile - will be fully expended by the end of June 2011.
- Hinkley – fewer workers have been served than planned, as they started to re-hire when funds became available. The funds will not be fully expended by the project end September 30, 2011 and will be returned to the federal government.

## **6. Executive Committee Update**

The TCWIB Executive Committee met on April 26, 2011 and June 2, 2011 to discuss and review the One Stop Operator (OSO) MOU, EMDC's proposal to use the TCWIB as the CEDs advisory council, review current budgets, Hinckley NEG mid-point review and outcome and the current budget proposals by the house and senate.

- Currently working on the formation of a Personnel Committee and Ken Proctor was asked to serve as Chair and liaison to the Executive Committee.
- A proposal to conduct a 3<sup>rd</sup> party workforce review/monitor for the entire TCWIB model was brought forward by TCIWB director requesting permission to fund between \$4,500 and \$10,000 to contract this out.
- Jake Ward, Assistant VP of Research, Economic Development and Government Relations at the University of Maine would like to conduct an asset map of the educational system in the Tri-County Workforce Area and requested under \$5,000 in funds. If we move forward with this, we would require a proposal and summary of the project, which has not been received. This project is an extension of the Educators Listening Session through Mobilize Maine where all educators are present to discuss outreach, curriculum and project development. The TCWIB Director is asking permission to fund the project.

***Motion to approve the Monitoring and Educational Mapping of our TCWIB program by Steve Pound; Seconded by Chuck Rohn. Approved.***

- 2 TCWIB Members nominated and approved by the CLEO Board:
  - Scott Cuddy, Electrician at IBEW1253 a construction local chartered out of Augusta, ME
  - Andrew Fitzpatrick, Plant Manager, Hinckley Yachts, Trenton, ME

***Motion to approve 2 new members to join the TCWIB by Chuck Rohn; Seconded by Jane Searles. Approved.***

### **Questions/Comments:**

**Q:** Can we highlight the goals of the education asset map and is this is going produce something that we can use as a tool to help sell this organization and recruit private sector members?

**A:** Yes, there will be a document and database as a result of the asset mapping of educators in the region. We will be provided access to the data and have something to put out to the community.

Our goal is to increase understanding of board activity and how that effects and impacts the educational system and the relationship to education, employment and economic development.

The goal with the monitoring project is to validate the new model and assure all activity is in compliance with WIA regulations.

### **Personnel Committee**

Ken Proctor from Mayo Regional Hospital explained that the Executive Committee met on April 26, 2011, and recommended the formation of a personnel committee. The primary function of the committee is to conduct the annual performance evaluation of the Executive Director. This committee will be comprised of 3-4 volunteers and would serve as an ongoing resource for addressing communication issues between board members and executive director, and vice versa, if needed. Committee will convene on an ad-hoc basis for a period not to exceed two years and evaluate how the process is working. Ken will serve as Personnel Committee Chair and liaison to the Executive Committee. (See attachment D – Personnel Committee)

*\*TCWIB members interested in volunteering to be part of the Personnel Committee please contact Ken Proctor or Dan Tremble.*

## **7. WIA Update**

Jon Farley, Director of Economic and Workforce Development discussed the WIA programs and the summary of the plans for this coming year. Funding for Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth programs total about \$1.5 million. EMDC will work to serve about 885 people with these resources, half would be new clients enrolled, the other half would be individuals carrying over from this year into next year (still in training or job search mode) The focus for the next year is to increase the number of individuals entering employment is to raise the wage levels and fringe benefits. Our area lags behind the state average.

(See attachment E-PY11 WIA and attachment F-Maine WAI Performance)

**Adult** - Plan to serve 275 individuals (average wage \$10.45 p/hr and it's been increased to \$11.20 for next year).

**DW** - Plan to serve 360 individuals – most intensive (400 former mill workers from Katahdin) pursuing resources to provide re-employment opportunities.

**Youth** - Proposing most change in the coming year to serve older, out of school youth at a higher level, higher % of the total population, to assist them with moving into employment and further education, which would reduce emphasis on in school population. Planning to serve 60% older youth, as they can be placed into jobs and 40% in school, younger, the opposite of plan last year.

***Motion to approve PY11 budget and program plans by Ken Proctor; Seconded by Gordon Stitham. Approved.***

## **8. TCWIB CEDS**

Michael Aube discussed TCWIB transitioning into a new CED's process. There are two goals, one to complete the activity required of EMDC to rank and prioritize projects that come from out in the field and

the second part, we learn from each TCWIB member a new process to establish. This region wants to make sure that workforce development career paths are a critical part of the decision making in terms of public investment and infrastructure to advance those types of activities. This is the fifth year of a five year plan and today is the last time we're updating the information. Next year we will engage the TCWIB into a more comprehensive process resulting in a richer document.

EMDC Jen Brooks outlined the process used to review and rate each project listed in the summary. She explained that the review should be completed during this meeting. The assessment process will consider supporting the established Mobilize Maine Goals. The scoring will range from high, medium or low priority projects listed recognizing those that align with our strategies for the region. If it doesn't fall within the grid then it's not consistent with the strategies and goals of Mobilize Maine.

(See attachment G-Goals, H-Grid, I-Project Summary and J-Project Summary Details)

### **Questions/Answers:**

**Q: We talked at the Executive Committee about conflict of interest and how that may apply to this as I'm a resident of SAD22, so that 1<sup>st</sup> project on the list is very appealing to me, but as a citizen of the greater Bangor area it would be permissible to vote on, just thought it would be helpful, as a couple of the projects are here from EMDC?**

A: This is not from EMDC it's from Mobilize Maine, we typed it up, but we're not the applicant.

**Q: Should we send the project summary sheets electronically or does the form need to be handed in?**

A: Fill it out, scan it and email it to the Executive Director to have on record, or just mail it.

**Q: In reading through these projects what hit me so strongly is that there really isn't any emphasis on the number of jobs created and that's where we come from, so I just wanted know what the timetable is from when we provide input?**

A: The 3<sup>rd</sup> part of this morning was to possibly do a list on the boards of what are the values that we want to add to the criteria and maybe develop some options and come back to you all by September 2011.

**Q: Can we see wages and benefits attached to some of these jobs?**

A: Yes, we can add that as criteria, moving forward.

**Q: Last year we had goals for green technology, green energy, specific industries?**

A: You're talking about the ARRA core industries that we were mandated to follow through the governor which we now we have a waiver to recognize industries that are much broader. What he's speaking about are the industries we are supposed to look at we're provided training funds to individuals. For ex: if someone came to the Career Center and meets with one of the EMDC workforce staff and says, "I want to become a fashion designer in Dover-Foxcroft." We have to be responsible for the funds that we're allocating to individuals and we would ask them how likely they would become employed and successful in the industry? So this particular individual would not likely receive funds. The industries that you're referring to are, energy, healthcare, green jobs, tourism, hospitality, manufacturing, logistics, IT, education, etc. It's our responsibility in the workforce system to manage the industries that were mentioned.

**Q: If the project requires different funding than the traditional EDA funding mix should that come into play in terms of our selection?**

**A:** No, because the charges to try to find support and funds for whatever are the highest priorities, whether it's EDA, HUD or a foundation that is not the determining factor in your decision making, it should be what's going to create investment and jobs in our region. We'd like to get away from using the CED's as just the document to get EDA funding, we really would like it to be the our economic development strategy for the region, regardless of the source of funds for any project.

**Comment: In regards to funding, there are 5 projects here that the money will not pertain to our whole entire strategy.**

**A:** I think you need to go into this thinking there's a large pool of funds, we don't need to look at dollars. Brewer has an example of the business park and asking for a certain amount of dollars and they plan to use tax increment financing to maybe fill part of that and that's obviously dependent on what they're going to track for investment and what the value of that investment is. We're really not in a position to judge where the balance of funds are, we're just saying go for it. It isn't tied just to one funding source, but rather would this project make sense in our region and if it does, let's find out where we can identify the funding to make it happen.

**Q: How do we figure out hard or easy? What's the process?**

**A:** Why don't we just start with that point and use that as an example.

**Q: How can we get recommendations back to the project coordinator?**

**A:** This is a perfect opportunity to look at those types of collaborations. Our hope is that once this priority list is developed by the board today we would then cleanse that and put it in a document that we could share with all of our groups in Mobilize Maine to foster that kind of collaboration.

**Q: How do we add value?**

**A:** I think we're all talking about restructuring the application process for next year.

**Q: High impact, low impact, hard or easy, is that effort?**

**A:** Yes.

**Q: Could an indicator of high and low effort be how far along the project is towards completion?**

**A:** Yes, what we're looking at is this a low hanging fruit, can we jump on this right now and see immediate results.

**Q: Is project 1 a low effort or a high effort, I perceived it to be high effort?**

**A:** There was a discussion of confidentiality, so that's up to you all to decide.

**Q: Can you define mundane and common?**

**A:** Again there's no prescriptive way of doing this, it's how you want to interpret.

**Q: Are we planning on going through all 24 of these today?**

**A:** Yes.

**Q: What's the scoring system, prioritize 1-24?**

**A:** Indicate what category they fall in, whether it's high priority, priority, consistent with our strategy or not even on the grid. For ex: high priority being the ones that we will accomplish this year.

**Q: What is project # 4?**

**A:** It's a green energy park using some of the waste refuse to provide energy to businesses located in that park and to the university, biomass.

**Q: Project 8, should we take into consideration that \$2 million for 30 jobs and project 6 has \$900,000 for 35 jobs?**

**A:** That 2 million carries through each phase of the project.

**Q: How do we measure that the money is being used properly?**

**A:** We all agree this system needs improvement in terms of assessment and ranking and the greater conversation is going to happen when we're done ranking this process, so we can reshape the ranking process.

**Q: Are we advocates for them?**

**A:** It's more than advocacy, in that it's been through a system that says this would be a welcome investment in our area.

**Q: What is the proper dollar amount of project 10?**

**A:** 4 million.

**Q: Can we guesstimate the percentage that our endorsement impacts on the final decision?**

**A:** It's 2-4 projects per year we would get funding

**Q: How much do we impact the process?**

**A:** Fairly significant

**Q: Should people have strategies to get business parks expanded?**

**A:** Are there parks within a 25 mile radius and if not, then they won't get funding unless it's a specialized park to which there is a marketing strategy.

**Q: Let's say \$4 million creates 100 jobs and \$50,000 creates 20 jobs, so the \$50,000 would be a bigger bang for the buck?**

**A:** Yes, EDA looks at \$30,000 per job now, so there rule of thumb is, if you can demonstrate 10 permanent jobs that need certain wage standards, you'd get \$300,000 roughly.

**Q: What's the time frame here?**

**A:** Assuming there's an appropriation, next fiscal year, October 1.

**Q: Are we required to have a new 5 year plan completed by July 1, 2012?**

**A:** Yes. Assuming they keep the same schedule. This time next year we will be tying up the project.

**Q: Would you recommend that after the September meeting when we've come back together after this process that we pull together an ad-hoc group to look more closely at the process?**

**A:** Several players are being reauthorized and we don't know what that would be, so as of today, reauthorization isn't done yet.

***TCWIB feedback: add criteria to the CEDS application process next year:***

1. Collaboration
2. Career Paths
3. Wage Benefit Levels
4. Asset Development
5. Strong Private Sector Commitment
6. Using Existing Infrastructures
7. Looking at sectors for the areas we're serving
8. A greater description of what that leveraging will be and identify different sources.

***TCWIB suggestions related to strengthening data and information in the application :***

- Projected timeline
- List priorities and sectors on applications
- Tax impacts
- Job description criteria
- Sectors
- Coaching and feedback
- How do they evaluate the impact of their project?
- Provide a spreadsheet with a grid
- What's their marketing strategy?

EMDC will draft a more prescriptive process to be sent out to the TCWIB. EMDC will report out at the next TCWIB Meeting, September 8, 2011.

**Next Steps:**

Identify criteria to assist TCWIB members in supporting regional goals and objectives.