

Southwest Iowa LWDA CEO Meeting Minutes – 3/2/23

Thursday, March 2, 2023, 5:30pm
Union County Courthouse 300 N Pine St #6, Creston, IA 50801

Attendees: Amanda Mcvann, Jesse Bolinger, Dan Christensen, Wendy Greenman, Charla Schmid, Dennis Brown, Jerry Walker, Ron Fitzgerald, Dean Robbins, Randy Taylor, Scott Aiken

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Agenda approval
 - a. MOTION: SO MOVED
4. Approval of January meeting minutes
 - a. MOTION: SO MOVED
5. Discussion with Wendy Greenman
 - a. Distributed a local area map
 - b. Subrecipient discussions need to move forward
 - i. Funds should be going to a true, local recipient
 - ii. Current Options:
 1. The department of labor has the funds and we are a pass through entity
 - a. Those funds should go through CLEO's unit of government
 - b. The local government helps manage and procure a service provider, which currently the MATURA Action Agency
 - c. The local board also oversees the One stop operator, which is not currently in operation in Southwest Iowa
 2. Now, we are contracting funds directly to a fiscal agent and that is not what should be happening
 - a. We need to get the order corrected
 - c. Charla: So we want to get rid of the fiscal agent?
 - i. Dan: the subrecipient would be the auditor of my county, so it would come to our auditor and they don't want to do that. So the fiscal agent works with Jesse through RC&D (Erica)
 - d. Three options:
 - i. The CLEO's unit of government serves as the grant recipient
 1. What Dan shared, not in
 - ii. Th CLEO designates an alternate local entity to serve as the grant recipient
 - iii. The CLEO's unit of government serves as the grant recipients and still works with a fiscal agent
 - e. The CEO's could opt to dissolve the 2088 agreement and refuse the federal funds, such as Western Iowa's LWBD did and will no longer serve in that capacity (i.e. giving up roles/responsibilities for funding in this area)
 - i. Charla: Who serves those counties?

- ii. Wendy; the the department of labor said that if any local areas dissolve, the constituents of those local areas still have to be served; so the State would be liable to make sure that happened
- iii. Dan: So if that happened, then that would be this Board would be of no purpose anymore?
 - 1. Wendy: correct; and a new local Board would be seated; there would no longer be any supervisors
- f. Wendy: has 3 vacancies, so the Local board had the opportunity to receive a waiver but it's too late now to submit at this time. Due to that, local board is noncompliant due to the open vacancies and has no power to make decisions
 - i. Other areas of concern that were found included absence of meeting minutes on the website, not having agendas posted to the website, documents not being sent timely ahead of meetings, and meetings being suddenly canceled
 - ii. In regard to performance:
 - 1. In the June 2022 – June 2023 program year (PY), within all 8 counties, only 14 people were served: 3 adult, 4 dislocated workers, and 7 youth
 - a. The budget for that PY was \$433,911
 - 2. To date, the local board has only served 13 people: 7 adult, 0 dislocated workers, and 6 youth
 - 3. There was an area of concern on: low enrollment and low expenditures
- g. Projected financials:
 - i. In the first year of those funds, those 80% funds have to be spent or obligated; in the second year, they have to be returned back to the State
 - ii. They are behind in submitting those funds back to us
 - 1. The estimated fund that has not been spent which will be returned to the state (which are based on what is estimated on what should have been spent):
 - a. \$96,747.96 – adults
 - b. \$59,363.07 - dislocated worker
 - c. \$113,042.22 – youth
 - 2. Those funds were given on July 1, 2022
 - a. \$0 across all three of those programs have been spent/obligated
 - 3. This local area, at the end of year two (6/30/2024), you would be returning the following:
 - a. \$107,054.96 – adult
 - b. \$76,618.00 – dislocated workers
 - c. \$121,967.22 – youth
 - iii. There are still concerns with enrollments, service provisions, and expenditures from the funds

- iv. Charla: have all those who have been served are all in one county, two counties, etc.? For example, has anyone from Montgomery county even been served? There has to be a reason that enrollment has been so low (i.e. no computer, no transportation, etc.)
 - 1. Wendy: that's what the service provider should be able to procure those services; that is something that they should be thinking about and doing;
 - 2. There are IWD employees who are Title III who work with clients as well on workforce readiness
 - v. Dean: if we're being asked to work through this over the last 2 years and our provider can't do it, can we hand it back over to the State?
 - 1. Wendy: that is an option
 - 2. Dan: Erica works for RC&D and they are technically the fiscal agent (Jesse: she's the contact at the fiscal agent, which is RC&D)
6. Discussion with Executive Director
- a. Jesse: we've been able to fill 6 vacancies since i started, but I didn't know that not having all the seats filled would make us in non-compliance; most other Boards have a full-time Executive Director but that's not where we're at right now; the higher education spot has been the hardest to fill; we're currently working on state monitoring and i'm learning a lot
 - i. I am concerned about our service provider, MATURA
 - 1. Their communication hasn't been working; they need 3 full time employees to work; they don't seem to care & have no interest in trying new things because they're stuck in what they know; their numbers have improved, but they are not where they should be
 - 2. One Stop Operator needs to be done as well; I've only found one other place (EQUUS) and we couldn't move forward because we can't afford them
 - 3. If we get rid of MATURA, I don't know who our service provider would be
 - ii. I've talked with one of the juvenile justice outlets in the state, and I want to know if they can be one of the subrecipients for our local area
 - 1. Wendy: it's not in the regulations that a subrecipient cannot serve in that capacity for multiple local areas, but that's not the best
 - a. The needs for here versus Polk County are different, which is why it could be problematic
 - 2. Jesse: we now have three boards that are going to give up their funds
 - iii. Our service provider (MATURA) is so focused on HeadStart that they're not able to focus on other things, and they're involved in too many things
 - 1. Jerry: MATURA doesn't help any other county but Union
 - b. Charla: What does the service provider do?
 - i. Jesse: they're supposed to administer adult, dislocated worker, and youth programming but there are 8-10 things that they are supposed to do but

Danna can't tell me how (so I have to say "no" to online documentation); transportation also seems to be a barrier to what they can provide and always has been an issue

7. Vote on board direction•

- a. Dan: you've seen the numbers, any more discussion?
- b. Jesse: we've talked about these four options, one of the other options is to find a subrecipient and become a 501c3; but we've not found a subrecipient, so I will do whatever you want to do
- c. Dennis: So whatever the State decides, we lose control?
 - i. Dan: if there is a shortfall, each county will be asked to come up with funds from tax dollars
 - ii. Charla: would we be responsible, if we dissolve, for the shortfall?
 1. Jesse: no, but you as supervisors would not be fully serving your counties because you are giving up control to the State;
 - iii. Dennis: We've lost population over the last few years, but can we do what we were doing 10 years ago when we were successful with the money we've been allocated?
 1. Wendy: you could, but the whole allocation is based on a lot of different factors
- d. Wendy: Western Iowa has already given up their financial responsibility, so if that hadn't happened yet then all 8 county supervisors in this year would be fiscally liable for all of those counties if we wanted to take them on
- e. Charla: we haven't done well, but I do like local control and you understand your own counties but
 - i. Jerry: we don't have a One Stop Operator, we want to get rid our service provider, we're not in compliance, and we're missing out 3-4 board members
 1. Jesse: if I could increase my hours, I could work towards bringing our Board into compliance; Graceland is just figuring out who they want to look into putting on the Board; I want to look towards a new service provider; one of my hopes is to make more national connections but we don't have any policies on using Ticket to Work funds
 2. Charla: What about time for a new service provider?
 - a. Jesse: I don't feel that when the RFP went out for the service provider, there was only 1 applicant; I'm not sure if the procedure was followed well; MATURA shouldn't have been selected; this board and that application hasn't been marketed that well into the community; I need to be able to promote our local boards and use social media to tell people who we are to queue and fill seats
 - ii. Dan: we were supposed to have our subrecipient submitted by February and that's been past that date
 1. Ron: how would our areas get served by the State?

- a. Wendy: I wouldn't know nor want to speculate
 - iii. Jesse: I think Michelle and Wendy have difficult jobs, such as getting the final subrecipient agreement
 - iv. Ron: When does that take over?
 - 1. Dan: until July 1st
 - 2. Charla: would the counties, would there be communication to them by the State if we give over control?
 - f. Dan:
 - i. Jerry: Motion to dissolve the CEO and return the federal funds
 - 1. Dean: seconded
 - ii. It has to be unanimous: It is unanimous
 - 1. Dennis: aye
 - 2. Ron: aye
 - 3. Charla: aye
 - 4. Jerry: aye
 - 5. Scott: aye
 - 6. Dean: aye
 - iii. Wendy: you have no financial responsibility to the funds anymore if you return power back to the State
 - iv. Charla: Is that money coming from our counties?
 - 1. Jesse: no; funds are just being returned back to the state
 - 2. It's all federal funds
 - g. Until July 1, 2023, we have control of this decision until the State takes over
8. Establish Next Meeting
 - a. Jesse: let's meet in April and no more Zoom meetings with this group, and there will be no more Board meetings
 - i. Wendy: we'd like written documentation sooner rather than later, and there is a 90 day requirement prior to the end of the program year so it'd need to be done by this month
 - ii. I'm going to be on vacation
 - 1. Dan: let's meet the end of March
 - b. Tuesday, March 21 @ 5:30 PM in-person at the Courthouse
9. Adjournment
 - a. MOTION: SO MOVED

Action Items:

- jesseo@bolinger.org must draft the letter by the middle of next week
- Upcoming meeting:
 - o Tuesday, March 21 @ 5:30 PM in-person at the Courthouse