


REPORT FROM

OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

Date: May 20, 2014

CAO File No. 0220-01024-2746
Council File No. 14-0451
Council District: Various

To: The Mayor
The Council

From: Miguel A. Santana, City Administrative Officer 

Reference: Economic and Workforce Development Department transmittal dated April 8, 2014; received by the City Administrative Officer on April 10, 2014

Subject: **REQUEST TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO PROGRAM YEAR 2014-15 WORKSOURCE CENTER OPERATORS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

SUMMARY

In a joint Transmittal dated April 8, 2014, (C.F. 14-0451) (Transmittal), the Economic and Workforce Development Department (EWDD) and the City of Los Angeles Workforce Investment Board (WIB) request Council and Mayor approval of 17 contract service providers (see Attachment) and the establishment of a Replacement Operator List to provide employment and training services as WorkSource Center (WSC) Operators for the Youth and Young Adult System Support (YYAS) for the WIB Program Year (PY) 2014-15. This Office concurs with the Department's recommendations.

The EWDD selected the recommended service providers as a result of a Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The contract with each provider is proposed to commence on July 1, 2014 for a period of one year with four one-year renewal options. EWDD anticipates funding for each of the 17 contract providers to be \$1.075 million for one year, for a total of up to \$18.28 million, and the funding source to be the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Fund. Funding and contract authority for these services will be addressed in the PY 2014-15 WIB Annual Plan anticipated for Council consideration in June 2014. EWDD also seeks to establish a Replacement Operator List consisting of the 17 proposed WSC Operators and the non-funded WSC proposers which received an RFP score of 70 or greater.

Pursuant to Los Angeles City Charter Section 1022, the Personnel Department determined that there are no City employees with the expertise to perform the work.

BACKGROUND

On June 25, 2013, Council adopted a Report from this Office dated June 20, 2013 (C.F. 13-0728) on the PY 2013-14 WIB Annual Plan which included an instruction to the General Manager of EWDD to evaluate existing contracts and develop RFPs and/or Request for Qualifications (RFQs) for service providers and contractors for which sole source or City contracts had been awarded in excess of

three years without a formal procurement in order to comply with requirements of the WIA, the Los Angeles Administrative Code and the Los Angeles Charter. The Department was instructed to report back to Council and Mayor with recommendations prior to consideration of the PY 2014-15 WIB Annual Plan.

Request for Proposals Process

The EWDD released an RFP to select service providers for the City's WorkSource Center System on October 18, 2013. The Department received 26 proposals by the due date of December 19, 2013. Through this RFP, the Department sought to re-design the Workforce Development System with the following key innovations:

1. Career Pathways opportunities in high-demand employment sectors leading to living wage employment;
2. New technologies and web-based applications to better serve participants;
3. Implementation of an Integrated Service Delivery Model that will encourage WSCs to enroll all eligible participants;
4. Strategic partnerships with education, employment training and social-service providers for comprehensive services; and
5. Increasing service levels for vulnerable populations (e.g., returning veterans, individuals with disabilities, limited English proficient individuals, individuals experiencing homelessness, mature/older workers, ex-offenders, non-custodial parents) by mandating minimum service levels.

The EWDD's transmittal further discusses changes to be made to WSC sites and locations, the benefits of transitioning to a new Workforce Delivery System and key partnerships.

The proposals were evaluated using a point system with a maximum score of 100 points. The evaluation criteria used were as follows:

- Demonstrated Ability – 30 points
- Program Design - 40 points
- Cost Reasonableness - 20 points
- Site Visit - 10 points

The EWDD states that the rating of the Demonstrated Ability and Program Design aspects of the proposals was performed by third-party, volunteer evaluators consisting of individuals with expertise in workforce development and/or economic development fields. EWDD states that they employed the California State University Northridge (CSUN) to develop and validate a scoring tool, using a team of economists and workforce consultants with experience in evaluating Integrated Service Delivery Model Pilot Sites. Raters were provided an orientation on the goals of the Workforce Development System and were trained on the rating tools developed by CSUN prior to rating proposals.

A minimum score of 70 or higher was required for the proposer to be eligible for funding. Four proposals did not receive the requisite minimum score and one proposal was disqualified due to an incomplete application.

Appeals

All proposers were notified of their final scores in writing on March 3, 2014. Four proposers submitted requests for appeals by the March 10, 2014 due date. One appellant subsequently withdrew its request via correspondence. On March 24, 2014, the Appeals Board heard the appeals of the remaining three appellants. As prescribed by the Workforce Investment Board – Local Elected Officials Agreement, the Appeals Board consists of a representative from the Mayor's Office, the Chair of the WIB, the Chair of the WIB Youth Council, the Chair of the Economic Development Committee and the General Manager of EWDD. The original recommendations related to the results of the RFP process were sustained and are described in greater detail in the Department's transmittal.

RFP Results

As identified in the Attachment to this report, EWDD is recommending funding for 17 service providers, and proposes to include these 17 agencies, along with the four non-selected proposers which scored 70 or higher, on a Replacement Operator List. This list will be used in the event it is necessary to replace a proposed WSC Operator. The WIB approved these recommendations from EWDD on April 10, 2014.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Council, subject to the approval of the Mayor:

1. Accept the 17 service providers recommended as WorkSource Center (WSC) Operators by the Economic and Workforce Development Department (EWDD) and included in the Attachment of this report; and
2. Authorize the General Manager, EWDD, or designee, to establish a Replacement Operator List consisting of the 17 recommended WSC Operators and the additional four eligible non-selected proposers with a score of 70 or higher as listed the in Attachment of this report.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There is no impact to the General Fund. Funding for the City's WorkSource Center System is provided by Workforce Investment Act funds. Approval of these recommendations would authorize acceptance of 17 recommended WorkSource Center Operators and establish a Replacement Operator List. Funding and contract authority for these service providers will be addressed under separate cover in the forthcoming Program Year 2014-15 Workforce Investment Board Annual Plan anticipated for Council consideration by June 2014.

MAS:SAM: 02140110

Attachment

Recommendations

No.	Community Planning Area	Council District	Employment Sector	Final Score *	Funding
CENTRAL REGION					
006	Managed Career Solutions	Hollywood	13	1. Healthcare 2. Security	92.5 Recommended
018	Community Career Development	Wilshire	10	1. Logistics 2. Advanced Manufacturing	81.5 Recommended
012	Pacific Asian Consortium in Employment	Westlake	1	1. Green Technology 2. Financial Services	79.5 Recommended
010	Chicana Service Action Center	Downtown	14	1. Green Technology 2. Security	70.5 Not Recommended
020	Youth Policy Institute	Westlake	1	1. Healthcare 2. Construction	66.0 Not Eligible
022	Chinatown Service Center	Downtown	1	1. Healthcare 2. Financial Services	54.5 Not Eligible
EAST REGION					
011	Chicana Service Action Center	Boyle Heights	14	1. Green Technology 2. Security	79.5 Recommended
002	Goodwill Industries of Southern California	Northeast LA	1	1. Green Technology 2. Security	78.0 Recommended
025	Arbor E&T dba Rescare Workforce Services	Boyle Heights	14	1. Green Technology 2. Hospitality	72.0 Not Recommended
023	Community Career Development	Boyle Heights	14	1. Logistics 2. Advanced Manufacturing	- Not Eligible
HARBOR REGION					
017	Pacific Gateway	Harbor	15	1. Healthcare 2. Logistics	93.5 Recommended
007	Managed Career Solutions	Harbor	15	1. Hospitality 2. Construction	82.5 Not Recommended
NORTH VALLEY					
019	Youth Policy Institute	Pacoima	7	1. Healthcare 2. Financial Services	77.0 Recommended
005	Build Rehabilitation Industries	Chatsworth	12	1. Healthcare 2. Logistics	74.5 Recommended
008	El Proyecto del Barrio	Sun Valley	6	1. Logistics 2. Healthcare	71.0 Recommended
004	Build Rehabilitation Industries	Sun Valley	2	1. Security 2. Green Technology	67.5 Not Eligible
SOUTH VALLEY					
026	Arbor E&T dba Rescare Workforce Services	Canoga Park - Winnetka	3	1. Healthcare 2. Advanced Manufacturing	85.5 Recommended
009	El Proyecto del Barrio	Canoga Park - Winnetka	3	1. Logistics 2. Healthcare	76.0 Not Recommended
SOUTH LOS ANGELES					
014	Watts Labor Community Action Committee	Watts	15	1. Healthcare 2. Construction	91.5 Recommended
001	UAW - Labor Employmen & Training Corp	South LA	8	1. Construction 2. Advanced Manufacturing	87.5 Recommended
003	Los Angeles Urban League	Crenshaw	8	1. Healthcare 2. Hospitality	87.0 Recommended
015	Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles	Watts	15	1. Construction 2. Healthcare	80.5 Recommended
013	Asian American Drug Abuse Program	West Adams	10	1. Security 2. Construction	79.5 Recommended
021	Coalition for Responsible Community Development	Vernon-Central	9	1. Construction 2. Hospitality	78.5 Recommended
024	Community Centers Incorporated	South LA	8	1. Construction 2. Security	62.5 Not Eligible
WEST LOS ANGELES					
016	Jewish Vocational Services	Mar Vista	11	1. Financial Services 2. Security	82.0 Recommended

* A proposal with a score of 70 points or greater is eligible to receive funding under this RFP. However, a score of 70 points or greater does not guarantee funding.