



**Legislative Department  
Seattle City Council  
Memorandum**

Date: December 15, 2014  
To: CHASER Committee  
From: Patricia Lee, Council Central Staff

**Subject: Priority Hire Ordinance CB 118282  
Issue Identification**

---

On December 4, 2014 the CHASER Committee reviewed the substantive provisions of CB 118282 the Priority Hire ordinance. This ordinance seeks to increase access to construction jobs and careers for individuals who have historically not been equally represented in the industry including women, people of color and other disadvantaged individuals, particularly those living in Seattle and King County by; 1) increasing their access to apprenticeships, which are the pipeline to construction careers, and 2) increasing their job opportunities on city funded public works projects.

This memo identifies issues and potential options Councilmembers would like to explore and provides information requested at the December 4, committee meeting. I have cited those portions of the ordinance relevant to each issue and shown in underline and strike out the proposed changes. At the January 15, 2015 committee meeting, councilmembers will have amendments reflecting today's discussion, so they may vote on changes to the ordinance.

For ease of reference I have summarized the issues:

- Issue 1.** Should the ordinance be reworded to clarify that the priority worker hours are requirements and the citywide aspirational goal be separated out into a new sub-paragraph C?
- Issue 2** Should the Director's Powers to reduce or waive Priority Worker hour requirements or aspirational goals for women and racial minorities also include as reasons: 1) evidence that there is insufficient regional worker availability to achieve the percentages, 2) absent an executed PLA, and 3) at the FAS Director's discretion?
- Issue 3.** Should the ordinance contain an overall citywide aspirational goal as well as individual project goals?
- Issue 4.** Should the overall citywide aspirational goals be 20% in 2016 and 40% by 2025?

- Issue 5** Should the methodology and criteria for determining which zip codes qualify as Economically Distressed Areas be in the FAS Director’s Rules or ordinance?
- Issue 6.** Should the ordinance read the FAS Director is “authorized to require” or “shall require” the percentage of apprentice labor hours on a contract…?
- Issue 7.** Should language be added to the Findings section of the ordinance explaining the City’s experience determining Economically Distressed Areas in the Alaskan Way Seawall Replacement Project Community Workforce Agreement “Seawall CWA”?
- Issue 8.** Should the criteria of what a “Core Employee” is be negotiated and included in the PLA or be specified in the ordinance?
- Issue 9** Should the core employee exemption apply to each project, as stated in the ordinance, or to each contract. Open-shop contractors have requested, and FAS agrees, that it should apply to each contract.
- Issue 10** Should the number of Core Employees be increased from 5?
- Issue 11** Should the hiring process for Core Employees and Priority Workers be specified in the ordinance, established in the Director’s Rules, or negotiated in the PLA?
- Issue 12** If the hiring process is in the ordinance should the ordinance specify that open shop and WMBE contractors be allowed to hire all of their Core Employees before being subject to hiring union referrals under the PLA which will require the hiring of Priority Workers and hiring under the union dispatch rules?
- Issue 13** Should City’s reimbursement to the employer of dual benefits be mandatory?
- Issue 14.** Should the ordinance be clarified that the City will determine the comparability of health and pension benefits in determining when the City will reimburse employer costs for dual benefits?
- Issue 15** Should the 2016 program review include consideration of imposing a small fee on non-compliant contractors to help fund the program?
- Issue 16** Should the following definitions of union, union dispatch and training programs be added to the ordinance for additional clarity?

## Issues and Potential Options

Issues 1,2,3,4 and 5 relate to Priority Worker Hours and Economically Distressed Areas.

### *Calculation of Priority Worker Hours*

The ordinance provides that the FAS Director will establish the percentage of labor hours to be performed by Priority Workers in the bid documents for each Covered Project, i.e. a city public work project of \$5 million or more. 20.37.040 p. 13.

**Issue 1.** Should the ordinance be reworded to clarify that the priority worker hours are requirements, and the Citywide aspirational goal be separated out into a new sub-paragraph C?

### **20.37.040 Priority Hire**

A. For Covered Projects which are not found impracticable under Section 20.37.020, the Director shall establish in the bid documents the required percentage of Labor Hours to be performed by Priority Workers. The Director shall establish the percentages separately for Apprentices and for Journey-level workers. Contractors and dispatch halls under a PLA shall seek to first hire and dispatch Priority Workers so as to meet or exceed the required percentages.

B. For each Covered Project, the Director shall establish the greatest practicable required percentage of Labor Hours to be performed by Priority Workers by using past utilization percentages on similar public works projects from the previous three calendar years, and shall increase that percentage by no less than two full percentage points above past performance. The Director shall calibrate these required percentages ~~goals~~ annually and shall consult with the Priority Hire Implementation and Advisory Committee regarding these requirements. ~~goals~~.

C. In order to maximize the impact of this program in Economically Distressed Areas, the Director shall set project-specific requirements with the intent ~~goal~~ of achieving a total percentage of no less than 20% for all Labor Hours performed annually by Priority Workers on all the combined total of Covered Projects by 2016, and shall strive to achieve 40% of Labor Hours performed by Priority Workers by 2025. Annual percentage rates will ~~should~~ be measured ~~during~~ January 1- December 31 of the each applicable ~~specified~~ year.

Option A. Clarify the language in 23.07.040

Option B. Do not change the ordinance language

CHAHSER Comm Preference:

Recognizing the Priority Worker hours are requirements, the ordinance currently allows them to be reduced or waived if the work is required by an emergency, subject to limitations of a

sole source, another funding source or agreement with a public agency, in a remote location, or superseded by safety or other legal requirements. The Executive has requested the Director's powers also allow the Director to adjust requirements if there are not enough available workers, to recognize that in the first year there may be projects ready to proceed before a PLA is negotiated and to provide flexibility to tailor the needs to particular circumstances. SMC 20.37.020 p.12

**Issue 2** Should the Director's Powers to reduce or waive Priority Worker hour requirements or aspirational goals for women and racial minorities also include as reasons: 1) evidence that there is insufficient regional worker availability to achieve the percentages, 2) absent an executed PLA, and 3) at the FAS Director's discretion?

Option A Retain the Director's Powers as currently in the ordinance

Option B Change the Director's Powers to reduce or waive Priority Worker hour requirements or aspirational goals for women and racial minorities to include as reasons: 1) evidence that there is insufficient regional worker availability to achieve the percentages, 2) absent an executed PLA, and 3) at the FAS Director's discretion?

CHAHSER Committee Preference:
-------------------------------

*Citywide Aspirational Goal for Priority Worker Hours.*

The Ordinance currently provides for the establishment of Priority Worker hours for each "Covered Project", defined as a City public work project of \$5 million" or more. Priority Workers are individuals residing in Economically Distressed Areas, defined as geographic areas with comparatively higher rates of poverty, unemployment and low-educational attainment.

The Ordinance also includes an aspirational overall citywide goal of having 20% of all labor hours performed annually by Priority Workers on all covered projects by 2016 and 40% by 2025.

FAS reviewed data on city projects from 2009-2014 by project type and type of worker. FAS added 2% points, the minimum increase contemplated by the ordinance, to the current percentage of workers and came up with an overall citywide average of 17% of the project labor hours performed by individuals from Economically Distressed Areas if the Seawall Replacement Project hours are included and 15% if it is not. If the 20% citywide aspirational goal is kept, it will mean an additional increase of 3% if the Seawall Project hours are considered and 5% if they are not. Given the uniqueness of the Seawall project arguments can be made either way whether it is appropriate to include it so the City data was calculated with and without the Sewall project.

**Issue 3.** Should the ordinance contain an overall citywide aspirational goal as well as individual project goals? SMC 23.37.040 p.13; lines 22-24

Option A Retain the overall citywide aspirational goal in the ordinance

Option B Delete the overall citywide aspirational goal

CHAHSER Comm Preference:

**Issue 4.** Should the overall citywide aspirational goals be 20% in 2016 and 40% by 2025? SMC 23.37.040 p.13; lines 22-24

Option A Retain the goals as 20% in 2016 and 40% by 2025

Option B Retain the 20% goal in 2016 but reduce the 40% by 2025 to a lower number

Option C Retain the 20% goal but do not set any future goals until after the 2016 program review required by this ordinance.

CHAHSER Comm Preference:

*Economically Distressed Areas*

The ordinance defines an Economically Distressed Area as a geographically defined zip code found by the FAS Director to have a comparatively high concentration of poverty, unemployment and low-educational attainment. There will be two classes of such zip codes; tier one zip codes located within the City of Seattle and tier two zip codes located within King County and outside of the City of Seattle. SMC 23.37.37.010 p. 10 lines 3-8.

For the Seawall Project the City compared zip codes in King County using the following criteria;1) number of people living under 200% of the Federal Poverty Level, 2) number of unemployed individuals, and 3) number of individuals without a college degree. Zip codes with the highest concentrations, i.e. density per acre of at least 2 out of the 3 criteria were identified as Economically Distressed Areas. For the Seawall project the City identified 15 zip codes in Seattle and 11 zip codes in King County.

For Priority Workers, the FAS Director will adopt Director’s Rules that establish the benchmarks, and indicators to be used for finding a particular zip code qualifies as an Economically Distressed Area. The advantage to having the methodology and criteria established through Director’s Rules is the flexibility it provides the Department in implementing the program. The advantage to having it set forth in the ordinance is having the information in one document available to those affected by the ordinance and the general public.

- Issue 5** Should the methodology and criteria for determining which zip codes qualify as Economically Distressed Areas be in the FAS Director’s Rules or ordinance? SMC 23.37.02 (C) p. 12, lines 23-26
- Option A Retain the methodology and criteria for determining which zip codes qualify as Economically Distressed Areas in the FAS Director’s Rules
- Option B. Specify the methodology and criteria for determining which zip codes qualify as Economically Distressed Areas in the ordinance.
- Option C Specify the methodology and criteria for determining which zip codes qualify as Economically Distressed Areas in the ordinance and be more specific about the characteristics of historically underrepresented individuals this ordinance is seeking to increase participation in the construction industry.

CHASER Comm Preference:

The FAS Director is currently authorized to require up to 15% of the contract labor hours be performed by apprentices on city public work projects of \$1 million or more. The current ordinance increases this amount to 20% of the contract labor hours. It also changed the language from authorized to require to shall require. The executive has requested the language be changed back to authorized to require, to provide the FAS Director flexibility and the ability to tailor requirements to the particular contract.

- Issue 6.** Should the ordinance read the FAS Director is “authorized to require” or “shall require” the percentage of apprentice labor hours on a contract.
- Option A Retain the current ordinance language that the FAS Director shall require no less than 15% or more than 20% of the percentage of apprentice labor hours on a contract.
- Option B. Change the ordinance language from shall require to authorized to require.

CHASER Comm Preference:

**Issue 7.** Should the following language be added to the findings section of the ordinance explaining the City’s experience determining Economically Distressed Areas in the Alaskan Way Seawall Replacement Project Community Workforce Agreement “Seawall CWA”?

C 2. The Seawall CWA has an aspirational goal to hire 15% of the workforce from economically distressed zip codes as defined and prioritized by the City. Seawall Article

IX. The City compared zip codes in King County using the following criteria;1) number of people living under 200% of the Federal Poverty Level, 2) number of unemployed individuals, and 3) number of individuals without a college degree. Zip codes with the highest concentrations, i.e. density per acre of at least 2 out of the 3 criteria were identified as Economically Distressed Areas. For the Seawall project the City identified 15 zip codes in Seattle and 11 zip codes in King County.

- Option A      Add the above language to the ordinance findings C2
- Option B      Do not add the above language to the ordinance

CHAHSER Comm Preference:

*Project Labor Agreement*

The ordinance requires the FAS Director to negotiate and execute a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) for all city funded projects of \$5 million or more, defined as a “Covered Project” in the ordinance. Issues 5 -14 relate to provisions in the Project Labor Agreement.

*Women and Minority Owned Businesses (WMBE)*

Some WMBE firms have expressed serious concerns that PLAs will negatively impact their ability to successfully participate on city Covered Projects. Provisions in the ordinance on core employees and dual benefits, as well as the provision that the FAS Director may provide technical assistance to WMBE and Open-Shop Contractors in working in a PLA environment are intended to facilitate WMBE participate in PLA projects.

The next section of this memo addresses several issues that have been raised about the PLA provisions. In particular, WMBE and Open-shop contractors have requested changes to the number of core employees, the dispatch process and payment of dual benefits.

*Core employees*

In order to meet the percentage of labor hours to be performed by Priority Workers, the FAS Director shall require Contractors and union dispatch under a PLA to first seek to employ a Priority Worker who is a resident in a Seattle Economically Distressed Area. The second priority will be workers from King County Economically Distressed Areas, followed by workers from any other Economically Distressed Area. The ordinance also provides that every Open-Shop, or non-union contractor, may employ up to 5 Core Employees on each Covered Project. Open shop and some WMBE contractors have stressed the importance of keeping long established, functioning work crews together and have asked that the ordinance be changed to facilitate this. Below are several issues that have been identified on the issue of “Core Employee”.

**Issue 8.**      Core Employee is defined, in the ordinance, as an employee of an open-shop contractor that meets the core employee criteria established under a PLA.

Should the criteria of what a “Core Employee” is be negotiated and included in the PLA or be specified in the ordinance? SMC 23.37.010 p.9, lines 19,20.

- Option A Retain the ordinance language that the definition of a Core Employee will be negotiated and included in the PLA.
- Option B Define “core employee” in the ordinance.
- Option C Define “Core Employee” in the ordinance and use the definition used in the Seawall Replacement Project Community Workforce Agreement (CWA) Article VIII Section 11 “Core Employees are those that have been on the contractor’s payroll a minimum of 1200 hours in the 18 months prior to the Project, and on the Contractor’s active payroll a minimum of 60 days prior to start of work on the Project. Core Employees shall meet the minimum journey level qualifications of the craft they are performing and shall hold all required licenses and certifications for the work of their craft. The JAC may by unanimous vote change the minimum number of hours, or wave the definition of Core Employee Article VIII Sections 12 and 13 of the Seawall CWA. (underline added)

CHAHSER Committee Preference:

- Issue 9** Should the core employee exemption apply to each project, as stated in the ordinance, or to each contract. Open-shop contractors have requested, and FAS agrees, that it should apply to each contract. SMC 23.37.050 p. 16, lines 14-16
- Option A Retain the ordinance language that “The PLA shall permit an Open-Shop Contractor to employ as many as 5 Core Employees on each Covered Project...
- Option B Change the ordinance language to allow 5 Core Employees on each contract rather than project.

CHAHSER Committee Preference:

The ordinance provides that an open-shop contractor may employ up to 5 core employees. In the Seawall CWA Open Shop Contractors may identify 2 core employees. The average number of core employees contractors have requested in the Seawall CWA is 3 and the median number is 2.

- Issue 10** Should the number of Core Employees be increased from 5?
- Option A Retain the number of Core Employees as 5
- Option B Increase the number of Core Employees and allow more Core Employees to the extent they are also Priority Workers.

CHAHSER Committee Preference:

The ordinance provides that the Director will establish by Director's Rules the specific process by which Contractors, Union Dispatch and the Jobs Coordinator will collaborate to facilitate the hiring of Priority Workers. In the Seawall CWA open shop contractors are allowed to hire 2 Core Employees, and the rest of their employee needs are filled from union dispatch.

**Issue 11** Should the hiring process for Core Employees and Priority Workers be specified in the ordinance, established in the Director's Rules, or negotiated in the PLA?  
SMC 23.37.040 p. 14, lines 9-11

- Option A Specify the process in the ordinance
- Option B Establish the process in the Director's Rules
- Option C Establish the process in the PLA negotiations

CHAHSER Committee Preference:

**Issue 12** If the hiring process is in the ordinance should the ordinance specify that open shop and WMBE contractors be allowed to hire all of their Core Employees before being subject to hiring union referrals under the PLA which will require the hiring of Priority Workers and hiring under the union dispatch rules.  
SMC20.37.040 (C) p. 14, lines 3-11 and SMC 20.37.050 (D) p. 16, lines 14-16.

- Option A. Specify in the ordinance open shop and WMBE contractors may hire all of their Core Employees before being subject to hiring union referrals.
- Option B Do not add this language to the ordinance

CHAHSER Committee Preference:

*Dual Benefits*

A PLA is signed by the City and appropriate unions. Contractors are not required to become signatory to a union and workers are not required to become union members to be eligible to work or participate on a PLA project.

Employers are required to contribute to the union health and benefit plans on behalf of the worker and workers are required to pay initiation and representation fees, unless initiation fees are waived by the appropriate union. As some open-shop employers provide health and pension benefits they would then sustain dual costs. These costs for the dual benefits are addressed in the ordinance by requiring the FAS Director to establish provisions within the PLA that encourage Open-Shop subcontractors to compete and participate in Covered Projects, such as reimbursing existing employer-sponsored dual health and pension costs paid by Open-Shop Contractors.

**Issue 13**      Should City’s reimbursement to the employer of dual benefits be mandatory?  
SMC 20.37.05(C)

Option A      Retain the ordinance language which allows the FAS Director to negotiate and execute the mitigation of employer-sponsored dual health and pension costs paid by Open Shop Contractors in the PLA.

Option B      Change the language to make the payment of employer costs for dual benefits mandatory :  
C. The Director shall establish provisions within the PLA that encourage Open-Shop subcontractors to compete and participate in Covered Projects, ~~such as mitigating unique~~ including reimbursing existing employer sponsored dual-benefit health and pension costs paid by Open-Shop Contractors.

CHAHSER Committee Preference:
-------------------------------

**Issue 14.**      Should the ordinance be clarified that the City will determine the comparability of health and pension benefits in determining when the City will reimburse employer costs for dual benefits? SMC 20.37.05 (C)?

Option A      Retain the current ordinance language which allows the FAS Director to negotiate and execute the mitigation of employer-sponsored dual health and pension costs paid by Open Shop Contractors in the PLA.

Option B      Add to the ordinance language that the City will be the decisionmaker on whether open shop employer sponsored health and pension benefits are comparable and should be reimbursed by the city. Who decides comparability of benefits has been a question in implementation of the Seawall CWA.

CHAHSER Committee Preference:
-------------------------------

*Program Evaluation*

In 2016 the Mayor and Council will review program results and determine if the program should be expanded or amended by increasing or decreasing thresholds. It will also provide the opportunity to consider whether to include imposing a small fee on non-compliant contractors to help fund the program. 20.37.060 p. 17, lines 8-10

**Issue 15** Should the 2016 program review include consideration of imposing a small fee on non-compliant contractors to help fund the program?

Option A Do not change the current ordinance language

Option B Change the current ordinance language to include in the 2016 program review consideration of imposing a small fee on non-compliant contractors to help fund the program.

CHAHSER Committee Preference:
-------------------------------

*Definitions*

**Issue 16** Should the following definitions of union, union dispatch and training programs be added to the ordinance for additional clarity.

**Union:** is a representative labor organization whose members collectively bargain with employers to set the wages and working conditions in their respective trade or covered scope of work.

**Dispatch:** is the process by which a union or open-shop organization refers workers for employment to contractors under the authority of an agreement between employers or a collective bargaining agreement. The process typically mandates the distribution of work via a “first in, first out” priority but can legally be adjusted via special agreements to allow for out of order dispatching and priority worker hiring.

**Training Programs:** pre-apprenticeship and/or registered apprenticeship programs.

Option A Add the definitions of union, dispatch and training programs to the ordinance.

Option B Do not add additional definitions to the ordinance.

CHAHSER Committee Preference:

## **Information Requested**

The next section of this memo provides information requested at the December 4, 2014 CHAHSER committee meeting. The information was provided by FAS.

### **1. Support to Pre-Apprenticeship and Apprenticeship Programs and Participants**

*CM Harrell asked why people of color and women have lower rates of completing pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs and specifically how the strategies we anticipate the FAS Director will employ will mitigate these barriers or challenges.*

A number of factors are likely responsible for the lower rates of completion for pre-apprentices and apprentices who are underrepresented individuals. FAS commissioned a study (in draft currently) to identify very specific barriers. Initial analysis by Port Jobs, an organization connecting King County residents with jobs in the airport and construction trades, finds the barriers to entrance and success in pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship listed below. The Construction Careers Advisory Committee also identified many of these barriers in its final report. Clearly, these challenges are not limited to women and people of color.

#### **Pre-apprentice challenges**

- Application process/requirements.
- Driver's license issues.
- Financial insecurity.
- Household instability (childcare, housing, food insecurity, healthcare needs).
- Personal/lifestyle challenges.

#### **Apprentice challenges**

- Application process/requirements.
- Financial insecurity (layoffs/lack of work, unpaid classroom training, work expenses, money management skills).
- Challenging workplace.
- Personal/household issues (childcare, transportation, other personal issues).
- Lack of work skills.

FAS developed a framework for utilization of an additional \$100,000 in annual funds budgeted specifically to support students and construction workers, and related training programs (See SMC 20.37.030). The funding would be distributed based upon the analysis of identified need and greatest potential for impacting graduation rates of women, racial minorities, etc. FAS will work closely with the affected training programs, and keep the Advisory Committee apprised of our efforts so they can provide advice as the program is implemented. While competitive processes to determine program recipients would be performed as needed, the new procurement ordinance allows direct award to those community based non-profits that are specifically established for aiding disadvantaged individuals.

FAS recognizes City funding is not the only solution to address this complex problem. To study barriers in greater depth, FAS will conduct further internal analysis of other policy options. Input from consultants, as well as surveys, interviews and focus groups will aid this analysis.

## **2. Priority Hire Implementation and Advisory Committee**

*Councilmember O'Brien asked for a further discussion on the Committee specifically,*

- *FAS's experience in establishing and staffing committees tasked with similar objectives*
  - Construction Careers Advisory Committee (CCAC): FAS established the CCAC in coordination with the Mayor's Office and City Council and staffed the 15 member advisory committee over its six month duration.
  - American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC) – City of Seattle Committee: FAS established this committee in partnership with ACEC of Washington and convenes quarterly meetings with engineering companies.
  - Association of General Contractors (AGC) Contractor Community Committee: FAS established and staffs this committee in partnership with AGC of Washington to review and advise on City standard contract specifications.
- *How FAS plans to identify and provide the data the committee will need to monitor the effectiveness of the program, and have input on the annual calculation of Priority Worker Hours and any corrective changes that should be made, and*
- *Whether the ordinance provides sufficient clarity about the composition and role of the Committee?*

FAS finds the current draft legislation provides sufficient clarity on the composition and role of the advisory committee. The Priority Hire legislation requires the FAS Director form an Advisory Committee with representation by include labor unions, community organizations, contractors

(including WMBE firms), and training programs. The Committee's purpose is to provide advice to "the City" and it must be convened quarterly. The Committee may submit recommendations, findings or reports to the Director, Mayor and Council. The draft legislation requires FAS consult the Committee regarding the ZIP code methodology and the annual percentage requirements FAS establishes for labor hours performed by Priority Workers.

In addition to these directives within the proposed legislation, FAS would pursue the following approach for standing up the Advisory Committee. The general intent is to convene the original CCAC members to help define the Committee, provide advice on appointments, define scope of issues, and establish the regular reporting the Advisory Committee wishes to receive.

**Draft work plan:**

1. During Q1 2015, FAS would first work with the various stakeholder groups named in the legislation to receive input about their needs and advice for the formation of the Committee. FAS would initially include the leaders that served on the Construction Careers Advisory Committee.
2. Although the legislation directs FAS to form the Committee, FAS would seek concurrence from the Mayor in collaboration with Council to appoint individuals.
3. FAS would expect two representatives from each of the five named groups (unions, community organizations, general contractors, WMBE firms and training providers).
4. FAS will staff the committee to support quarterly meetings, and provide scheduling, distributing materials, taking notes, etc. The budget does not fund commissioning reports, studies or research on behalf of the Committee.
5. FAS would convene the Committee and facilitate early meetings to launch its work, such as its decisions on roles/responsibilities, guidelines, and agenda for quarterly meetings, standing agenda items and standard City-generated data/reports the Committee would seek to review and discuss.
6. FAS expects the Committee will want to comment on proposed Director Rules, which will include (per the legislation) ZIP code methodologies and rules for generation of the annual requirements/goals. FAS expects and is prepared to support a committee interest in remaining informed about specific projects, data showing progress, briefings on work items such as Job Coordinator functions, opportunities to provide input on basic strategic issues, such as worker recruitment strategies and similar topics.

### **3. Funding for Community based outreach and education.**

*CM O'Brien inquired how FAS will identify appropriate organizations, allocate the funding, and coordinate community based efforts with city staff.*

The following is a framework for utilization of the \$100,000 in funds that the City Council added to support the Priority Hire initiative, intending contracts specifically with community-based organizations (CBOs). As stated in the Seattle City Council Green Sheet, funds are solely for outreach and education by CBOs to identify potential workers from populations historically facing barriers in accessing construction careers. We expect the Advisory Committee will wish to provide advice as well.

**Draft plan for community based outreach and education funds** (\$100,000 each year for 2015 and 2016).

1. Working with the Advisory Committee, FAS will recruit and hire the Job and Training Coordinator.
2. Working with the Advisory Committee, FAS will scope priorities and goals for the funding.
3. Through a Request for Proposals (RFP), FAS will evaluate and select one or more community-based organizations to perform the work. One or more organizations will be selected based on a number of criteria, which will certainly highlight demonstrated experience in outreach and engagement with jobseekers underrepresented in the construction industry. The proposal responses will provide costing to cover staffing, administrative and outreach costs so the organization can be successful in carrying out the deliverables of the contract. Note that the Advisory Committee cannot be involved in evaluation and selection to the extent that CBO's on the Committee may also be interested in submitting proposals. While the new City Purchasing ordinance allows direct awards to non-profit CBOs that aid disadvantaged individuals, a competitive process will be helpful to assure a fair and equitable consideration of the many interested organizations for this work.
4. Identify performance measures and deliverables which may include:
  - a. Number of referrals to Job & Training Coordinator, pre-apprenticeship, apprenticeship, etc.
  - b. Number of outreach events, presentations or 1:1 information/intake sessions
  - c. Number of assessments of interested individuals
  - d. Number of placements and retention rates of referred candidates

