CCR Meet.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

ALASKA ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

NOVEMBER 6, 1987 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

810 N STREET, SUITE 101 277-0572 - 277-0573

277-8543

509 W. 3RD AVENUE 1007 W. 3RD AVENUE 272-7515

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

2

5

6 7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

2021

22

23 24

25

PROCEEDINGS

MR. ALEX: This meeting of the Alaska Advisory

Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Right will now

come to order.

We are convened here today to gather information on the status of State and Municipal programs for increasing the participation of minorities and women in the governmental contracting process.

I am Daniel Alex, Chairperson of the Advisory

Committee. The Advisory Committee receives information and makes recommendations to the Commission in areas which the Committee, or any of its Subcommittees is authorized to study.

Other members of the committee in attendance in the meeting are, Charles Elder, Gilbert Guitierrez, Linda Hawthorne, Dove Kull, Mitch Schapira, Rosalee Walker and myself. Arliss Sturgulewski will be here later. Thelma Buchholdt is in Washington D.C. so will not be here. Also we have John F. Dulles, II, from the Commission's Western Regional office in Los Angeles. John.

This consultation is being held pursuant to Federal rules applicable to State Advisory Committees and regulations promulgated by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.

The Commission on Civil Rights is an independent agency of the United States Government established by Congress in 1957 and directed to:

3

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

NUMBER 1: Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices.

NUMBER 2: Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting discrimination, or a denial of equal protection of the laws under the constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice.

NUMBER 3: Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to discrimination, or denial of equal protection of laws.

NUMBER 4: Serve as a national clearinghouse for information about discrimination; and

NUMBER 5: Submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

I would like to emphasize that this is a consultation and not an adversary proceeding. Individuals have been invited to come and share with the Committee information relative to the subject of today's inquiry. Each person who will participate has voluntarily agreed to meet with the Committee.

Since this is a public meeting, the press and the radio and the tevevision stations, as well as individuals are welcome. Persons meeting with the committee, however, may specifically request that they not be televised. In this case we

will comply with their wishes.

We are concerned that no defamatory material be presented at this meeting. In the unlikely event that this situation should develop, it will be necessary for me to call this to the attention of the persons making these statements and request that they desist in their action. Such information will be stricken from the record if necessary. If the comments a person is offering, however, are of sufficient importance, the Committee will hear the information. In that event, the persons against whom the allegations are made will have ample opportunity to respond by making statements before the Committee, or submitting written statement if they desire.

Every effort has been made to invite persons who are knowledgeable in the area to be dealt with here today. In our attempt to get a well-balanced picture about minority and women's business enterprises as they relate to the State of Alaska and to the Municipality of Anchorage, we have invited key public officials to share information with the Committee and exchange ideas and perspectives.

In addition, we have allocated time this afternoon at 4:00 p.m. to hear from anyone who wishes to share information with the Committee about the issues directly under the Advisory Committee consideration. At that time each person, or organization will have five minutes to speak to the Committee and may submit additional information in writing. Those wishing to

participate in the open session must contact Commission staff 1 before 4:00 p.m. today. 2 Let us proceed with the first panelist on the 3 agenda and I don't know that they're here. 4 MR. GUITIERREZ: Yeah, they're here. 5 MR. ALEX: Oh, yeah. 6 MR. GUITIERREZ: Can I make a recommendation 7 MR. ALEX: Sure. 8 9 MR. GUITIERREZ: to speak up a little bit 10 more? MR. ALEX: Sure. 11 12 MR. GUITIERREZ: I can't hear you and I'm sitting next to you. 13 14 MR. ALEX: Ray Price is here? 15 MR. GUITIERREZ: Yes. 16 MR. ALEX: Ray Price. Okay. We have Ray Price the special assistant to the Governor. One of the things, I quess 17 18 we all have name tags so you'll be able to tell who we are, but 19 Ray, you're on. Something before you get going, if you have a prepared statement, would like it summarized, we'd like to be able 20 21 to have an opportunity to ask questions. 22 MR. PRICE: Okay. Well, Mr. Chair, I do not have 23 prepared statements, or a prepared statement. I'm here for a couple of reasons, one, I was invited which I was pleased to be 25 invited, and the other is because the topic is one that is very

1 close to me personally, as well as to the Governor. And what I'd 2 like to do is to maybe give the Committee an update on where the 3 Cowper Administration is in regards to Civil Rights and then be 4 prepared to answer any questions the Committee might have. 5 MR. ALEX: Okay. 6 MS. WALKER: Mr. Chairman? 7 MR. ALEX: Yes. 8 MS. WALKER: Mr. Price, actually we would like to 9 restrict it to the WMBE (ph) program rather than just Civil Rights 10 in general. 11 MR. PRICE: Okay. I'm aware of that. 12 MS. WALKER: Because of time constraints. 13 Right. I'm aware of that. MR. PRICE: 14 MS. WALKER: Thank you. 15 MR. ALEX: Go ahead. 16 MR. PRICE: Mr. Chair and members of the 17 Committee, since December of last year I have been engaged in a 18 number of programs relating to minority business developments --19 minority and women business developments. 20 Specifically I have co-authored a reorganization 21 plan for all Equal Opportunity programs state-wide which includes 22 minority and women business enterprise specifically as it relates 23 to the Department of Transportation and the Department of 24 Administration. I'll address the Department of Administration 25 first.

As you all know the Department of Administration has what we consider to be a very cumbersome process for letting contracts, be they for procurement, or personal services. In addition to that these procedures do not include aggressive programs to enhance the participation of minorities and women. To help combat that situation the Cowper Administration followed up on an action that started in the previous administration which was to seek out and obtain a Federal grant for minority and business development.

We received that grant in January of this year.

It is housed and administered out of the Department of

Administration. The purpose of that grant is to work directly

with the Department of Administration in the area of procurement

and personal service contracting.

The program is headed by Nils Chodray (ph) who has a long history of involvement in both minority and female issues as well as economic development.

The program today has submitted two quarterly reports to the Federal government. They've indicated that they're extremely pleased with the progress to date. We're currently working on a policy statement and a program for the department heads not only in the Department of Administration, but in 16 departments to assist them in their contracting activities in terms of making the atmosphere a lot more conducive to minorities and women participating.

We expect that this session, or the following session, Legislative session, we will be presenting some legislation in that regard.

For the Department of Transportation,

(indiscernible) will be having a panel discussion on that. I can tell you that in regards to the reorganization plan as relates to minority and business enterprise originally the proposal — the reorganization proposal addressed that issue and requested that — or laid out rather that the — the transfer of that program from the Department of Transportation into the Governor's office in addition to other Equal Opportunity programs in the State.

As of Monday of this week we have finally come to a conclusion as to what scope the reorganization will take. We will be transferring from the Department of Transportation into the Governor's office DOT's internal EEO office and we will leave in the Department of Transportation for an unspecified length of time the certification process and the contract compliance process.

In addition to that the proposal outlined a number of proactive activities and programs and services that could be provided to minority and women business enterprise. The Department of Transportation has agreed to take a look at those suggestions that were made in the proposal. I've agreed to work with them on these proposals -- on these programs and we expect to have a fairly aggressive program in the Department of

Transportation as it relates to minority and women business enterprise.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Anyone have any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer those.

MR. ALEX: Okay. Questions? Yes, Arliss.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Mr. Chairman, if I may. Thank you very much. I appreciate the work that you're doing and you've had a good track record so I think we'll see some things. Would it be possible for you to make available to us the work paper, or is that an internal document?

MR. PRICE: No, it's a public document I've circulated all over the State already.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Fine. But I'd appreciate knowing — am I correct that— was it you that was involved in getting out the publication dealing with the minority firms that had been qualified by the State, or was that strictly a DOT, their directory of firms that qualified?

MR. PRICE: Yeah, I believe that's a DOT project.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Yeah. Would like to point out to you that I've had some calls from the business community which includes the minority firms. I think you should -- they should, and I've passed that along to the Commissioner, take a look about how long names are retained. For instance, there were a lot of firms from Outside the State of Alaska and I think that minority firms certainly within the State should be of a very major concern.

1 And it may simply be that the process that's followed, that perhaps 2 needs a bit of adjustment so that we're not listing everybody. 3 realize that, you know, once people are qualified 4 MR. PRICE: Um-hum. 5 MS. STURGULEWSKI: that perhaps they have 6 to stay on that list, but it dilutes it, I think, to have a lot 7 of Outside firms listed. 8 MR. PRICE: In response to that, Senator, we've 9 looked at that and that is a concern as it is in other areas in --10 regarding contracting. The -- one of the problems we have in 11 dealing with Federal dollars is that we cannot restrict the 12 participation of Outside minority firms when it comes to Federal 13 contracting. 14 Mr. Chairman, in no way do I --MS. STURGULEWSKI: 15 I -- I totally agree with that and that's as it should be, but we 16 do not have to advertise for the total United States of America 17 either. 18 MR. PRICE: Right. I understand. 19 MS. STURGULEWSKI: I understand that. 20 Further questions? Yes, Rosalee. MR. ALEX: 21 MS. WALKER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. 22 Mr. Price, that document, the EEO plan, has it been approved, 23 accepted by the Governor himself? 24 MR. PRICE: Yes, it has. 25 MS. WALKER: All right. Now we know that most of

1 the minority businesses -- minority and women businesses are 2 relatively small compared to the 3 MR. PRICE: That's correct. 4 MS. WALKER: others in this State and they 5 need some assistance prior to certification in many cases and 6 some of the positions in the Department of Commerce that did 7 offer this type of assistance were removed. Can you tell us how 8 that's going to be picked up? Where will that assistance come 9 from now? 10 MR. PRICE: Well, at this point I can't tell you 11 that. The reason I can't tell you that is under my plan, in terms 12 of the reorganization, I have specific ways in which we were going 13 to address that in terms of technical assistance and so forth. 14 DOT at this point has some resources to accomplish that task. And, 15 as I stated, we just finished on Monday coming up with a 16 compromised plan, or an amended plan and the details of that has 17 not been worked out yet. I do have some specific ideas however, 18 in terms of how to make that happen. 19 MS. WALKER: One other questions, please. 20 MR. ALEX: Sure. 21 MS. WALKER: It's my understanding from what you 22 said that certification in contracting will be left in DOT. 23 MR. PRICE: Certification and compliance. 24 MS. WALKER: Compliance. All right. And so what 25 does that leave for the EEO to be doing?

MR. PRICE: The internal EEO, which involves 1 2 protecting groups being hired and promoted in the Department of 3 Transportation, in addition to providing all of the Federal requirements regarding statistical data for the Department in 4 5 terms of how they hire and recruit women and minorities. 6 MS. WALKER: And how will that be communicated to 7 DOT in terms of the certification process and compliance? 8 MR. PRICE: Well 9 I mean, we know that agencies have MS. WALKER: 10 a history of turf business and the right-hand never knows what the 11 left-hand is doing and I wondered how you're going to get these 12 all together? They have to work together if it's going to work 13 at all. 14 MR. PRICE: I understand that. I understand that. 15 MS. WALKER: Um-hum. 16 And we actually have a dual conduit, MR. PRICE: 17 if you will, to make that happen. One being the Director of EEO, 18 or the new office of Equal Opportunity, I should say, and myself, 19 who as you probably know, I'm the EEO liaison for the Governor 20 and oversite officer, So we plan to make sure that we have a good 21 working relationship between the Department of Transportation and 22 the new office of Equal Opportunity. 23 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. MS. WALKER: 24 MR. ALEX: Okay. Further questions? Yes, Charles. 25 MR. ELDER: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Price, of course,

we don't have the details for (indiscernible - away from 2 microphone) 3 MR. PRICE: Right. 4 MR. ELDER: but I have a simple question. Do you see any inconsistency between the program that you're 5 6 working on and developing in respect to discrimination with the 7 proposed Alaska hire laws? 8 MR. PRICE: That's a good question. 9 understand your question, do I see any discrimination in our 10 program as it relates to Alaska hire? 11 MR. ELDER: I quess that's a fair statement, yeah. 12 MR. PRICE: Okay. Well, as you know that's a 13 real delicate subject. In terms of whether or not our program 14 would be discriminatory my answer to that is I would have to say 15 no, until it's challanged and proven. Otherwise, I would have to 16 say no it's not discriminatory. There are some precedents 17 MR. ELDER: Well, Mr. Price, I was asking your 18 opinion? 19 MR. PRICE: Oh, okay. Okay. Well, let me 20 qualify my opinion then. There are some precedents in the Lower 21 48 in terms of upholding actions taken to alleviate past 22 discrimination and some of the criteria that's used that the 23 courts have looked at has basically been, one, has there been 24 discrimination in the past and if it has is that discrimination 25 prevalent today. And are the programs designed to rectify that

problem on a set time frame rather than being perpetual and will it have enough flexibility to allow the participants to not -- I'm trying to find -- this is a real touchy area here. If it has enough flexibility and where it's not as rigid to where people can't comply with the requirements set forth by the program, so we feel that if we cover those bases that any programs that we put in place won't be discriminatory.

MR. ELDER: Thank you, sir.

MR. ALEX: Further questions?

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: Yes, Arliss.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: A program is as -- I guess, the effectiveness is determined a lot by the pool of contractors that you deal with and their success. Do you deal with organizations like the -- you know, the business community, the general contractors, the oil companies in any kind of a training program or are these pretty much are we dealing with mandatory programs, but not have much outreach to the firms who are really going to make the program work?

MR. PRICE: Well, in the past I -- you know, I'd have to say that I'm not aware of any aggressive programs like you just described. In fact, that's one area that I think is extremely important if we are going to have successful programs. It's my opinion, if I may, that too many times have we developed programs and tried to force-feed the business community. And I'm

1 of the opinion that what we need to do is develop these programs 2 in conjunction with the business communities. 3 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Have they been involved --4 Mr. Chairman, if I may. Have they been involved in the 5 preparation of the document? 6 MR. PRICE: Yes. I met with a number of business 7 people including the Associated General Contractors, Bill Snyder. 8 And, I have to say that I spent a lot of time traveling throughout 9 the State meeting with the various organizations and business 10 people across the State. 11 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Thank you. 12 MR. ELDER: Mr. Chairman? 13 MR. ALEX: Yes, Charlie. 14 MR. ELDER: And does that include conferring 15 with organized labor? 16 MR. PRICE: Yes. 17 MR. ALEX: Further questions. 18 MR. DULLES: Dan? 19 MR. ALEX: Yes, John. 20 Ask you just one question. MR. DULLES: 21 MR. PRICE: Sure. 22 MR. DULLES: Mr. Price, the WMBE program which is 23 administered by the Department of Transportation, is that program 24 state agency wide or is it restricted to contracts that are 25 funded or channeled through the Department of Transportation?

1 What I'm trying to get at is do you have a state-wide program that 2 would effect all contracts regardless of the nature of the funding, 3 regardless of funding source that they would be applicable to 4 every State agency? Are we talking about a comprehensive program 5 or are we talking strictly about a program that is generated as a 6 result of the Federal requirements under the Department of 7 Transportation? 8 MR. PRICE: Okay. Currently the State has no 9 program. The State does not have a program state-wide to address 10 women and minority business enterprise development. The Federal 11 programs that are administered by the Department of Transporation, 12 as you well know, is operated by DOT and is -- has goals and so 13 The program that I mentioned previously, the minorities 14 business development agency grant that we receive from the

MR. DULLES: Would that require State legislation to put that in place, or can

Federal government is designed to facilitate that state-wide

through all departments, but when it some to State -- pure State

MR. PRICE: Possibly.

dollars the State has no program.

MR. DULLES: that be done administratively?

MR. PRICE: We're looking at that now. We suspect that as we get into it and if we want the program to stand the test of time it may require some legislation to solidify it.

MR. DULLES: And that is being considered?

25

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

MR. PRICE: Yes.

MR. DULLES: Thank you.

MR. ALEX: Thank you. Further questions from the Commission? Thank you, Ray. I see we have Bob Poe and Ed Ramirez here from the State of Alaska, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities for the next panel and you're welcome to come up to the table.

MR. POE: We would also like to introduce Vertis Williams (ph) who is a certifying officer for DOTPF (indiscernible) section.

MR. ALEX: Thank you.

MR. POE: Well, first of all thank you,
Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you
all. As I understood the format, first, you wanted some comments
from us on how our involvement with the MBE program, internal and
external EEO programs and so forth have been and

MR. ELDER: Bob, we're having a little technical problem here.

MR. POE: Oh, I'm sorry.

COURT REPORTER: I know, I just want to know your name.

MR. POE: Oh, my name is Robert Poe. I'm sorry.

I'm deputy commissioner, Department of Transportation and to my
right is Ed Ramirez. He's the MBE coordinator, Department of
Transportation.

3

4

5

7 8

9

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

2324

25

MR. ALEX: I'll try to go and make sure that that's clearly understood.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. POE: Okay. So I understand that we have the opportunity to talk to you about our program and also to talk to you about some of the concerns we have in dealing with the program, implementing it, dealing with Federal agencies, that sort of thing, so with your permission I've prepared a few remarks and I might go into those and then I'd be happy to answer any questions you all would have.

MR. ALEX: Sounds good.

MR. POE: Okay. We -- under my part of the organization, we deal with the minority business, or DBE program today under the new Surface (ph) Transportation Act. External EEO which is to enforce contractors who are working under Federal programs to enforce their efforts towards Civil Rights affirmative action and also internally to the department those efforts. I'll speak mostly to those external functions because they deal with the Federal side.

One thing that we find is that the program is not standardized. That is, the requirements are not standardized across all Federal agencies and if I could offer some examples. Right now under DOTFHWA we have one program under the Surface Transportation Act we have a combined goal based on the DBE that has combined the WBE and the MBE goals together. They

have -- they're probably the most rigorous in terms of defining requiements for the program, making sure that they're enforced and so forth. The FAA is a lot more lax on that.

We also run into a situation where BIA comes into play. We'll have potential candidates for an MBE situation.

They want to be certified as a minority business enterprise and they'll say well, I have BIA certification already, so shouldn't I just be able to walk in and get certification under the FHWA program. And I'd love to tell that person, yes, but the answer is often no, because the requirements that are set out by FHWA are quite a bit more rigorous than there are by BIA.

Another thing that we run into is how FHWA, or DOT and FHWA interpret their requirements across their entire department. We have a situation right now where we have a letter from the General Counsel of FHWA which has determined that no wholly owned subsidiary of a Native Corporation can be an MBE. Startling revelation to me.

In the same token, I have a memo from Mr. Barnhart who says that they certainly are. I find a little conflict there and certainly that conflict is a difficult thing to enforce in an effective manner outside with the contractors we work with and with the minority and women's business enterprises that want to work with us.

Another problem we have is in terms of the requirements across all 50 states. I've been doing some testimony

on this this week. I just appeared before the Associated General Contractors convention yesterday and received about a half hour of extreme verbal abuse on the program. One of the -- one of the -- I don't mean to make light of it, but it is a -- it can be a pretty brutal situation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the things that they'll talk to us about is how the requirements are applied across the 50 states. example, in Alaska we're trying to certify firms in the area that they're qualified to do. So for instance, I'll give you an I think it was Northway Natives Association, there are categories that you can be certified in and they're certified in several, maybe 20 different categories.

One category that does not exist is project management. We had a firm that was using them for project management and that was disallowed in meeting the goals, but getting to the real argument in there, several states don't enforce this work category area. That is, if you're qualified for striping, or brush cutting, or concrete work, or what have you that doesn't mean you're qualified to do something very different than that, say surveying. If you're qualified for concrete doesn't mean you're qualified for construction surveying, as an example.

Well, we enforce that pretty strictly. That is, you've got to come in and demonstrate the ability to do the job; demonstrate that the individual, or individuals who own the

277-8543

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3.

4

company and are qualifying under the requirements of the certification can perform a commercial, useful function in that specific area. Well, that's not across all states, so the AGC which is across all states certainly makes us well aware that that is not applied equally and they say, well, they don't do it in this state, so why are you all doing it. I should be able to hire this minority business enterprise and have them do whatever I want them to do. It's up to me. I have the contract. If they don't perform it's my -- I'm the one who is going to be in trouble. I'm the one who is going to be having to make that up. Yet FHWA is very certain that we should enforce that certification and we do our best. We do our level best to do that, but it would help an awful lot if they were consistent across the whole country especially in -- against groups like the Associated General Contractors.

And I'll tell you I have a bent (ph) on this. I really believe if they spent half the time complying that they do complaining they would have a lot less trouble, but nevertheless, they seem much more apt to argue.

One of the things that would help us a lot -- I noticed -- we had a meeting with FHWA, I think it was about four, or five months ago. The regional director came up and so forth to talk to us about our program. I noted that just on this regional visit they probably had as many people as we had working on the program watching us work on the program.

It would be nice if, for instance -- one of the reasons that Ed is on board and Ed, you know, I think has made a lot of improvements in the last three and a half months that he's been on, a lot of improvements. I would say comparable to the last five years with the State Department of Transportation in terms of improvements.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the things that we're really focusing on is not just being a bureaucratic organization that just says yeah you're qualified, or no, you're not and out the door and we're not going to use our brains at all in this process, we're trying to educate the public on what it takes to be qualified, what the rules are, what the logic is and I'll get to logic in a minute, but what the rules are, what it takes to be qualified, offer assistance in doing that, offering assistance to contractors in better understanding it so that that marriage can work much better but that outreach program takes people, takes money and, of course, the more people we get interested in this and the more people we make qualified that buries us with more applications. And then, we have not enough people to do the work and so forth, so I think if, on one hand, the Federal government is very committed to making this happen, to making it work, to encouraging minority and women business enterprises to succeed, to become viable enterprises in the future that we -- if we could see more funding in the supportive servies area it would be an awfully big help to us, so I put my pitch out on that right now.

One of the other things we run into -- and I'll go through my list of complaints and then like I'd said I'll be happy to answer any questions and also turn it over to any -- any points Ed had. We went over this together this morning.

Simplifying the paper work would be an awfully big help. One of the problems that comes up is recertification.

Hey, I went through all this stuff before, you know, why do I have to file all this additional paper work to just have you reiterate the fact that I am qualified — that my firm is qualified.

One problem we have is, of course, DOT hasn't always done the same quality job over the years so some of the firms that were certified in the past may have been inappropriately certified and we have to look at them. And we do that. We try very carefully to make sure that if we've got some bad ones out there that we take care of that.

over here, this is just a front operation and really this big construction company is really financing that company and is doing everything to make that work for them, we want to know about it and we really try to look into that. But, for those legitimate companies that really should be certified and recertified on a regular basis a simplification of that process would help quite a bit.

I know you probably hear that all the time and with respect to the Federal government streamlining the paper work

1

4

3

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

but -- and sometimes the paper work -- to streamline the paper work is bigger than the paper work you started to streamline in the first place.

Personally one of the problems that I have with the Federal programs is that they really often times never have to face the impact of their programs.

As an example, yesterday at the AGC I didn't see any FHWA people there. Not a one of them. They didn't have the budget to come up. We had the budget to come up. They didn't have the budget to come up. I kind of think that all managers make resource allocation decisions and I think that might have been a convenient choice on their part. But they can be real hard nosed about, you know, what it takes and, oh, you know, their — they've got religion about the whole thing, but they're not out there trying to explain it to the people that are affected by it.

And so, here we have this big budget and they're watching over us diligently, but I think that they would bring a lot more realism to their programs if they were out there, if they were forced to.

I'm kind of harping back to a little legislative intent we had in DOT this year. One legislator from the bush thought it would be a good idea if all the top management had to replace -- when people from the bush went on vacation if we had to go out to the bush locations to work there and understand a

little bit more about what problems they face and I could see that legislator's point of view. Maybe the same could reciprocate on the Federal agency standpoint. It would help if they got out and saw it and worked with it and really answered the questions. When they have been in front of them they don't answer the questions. They just say, well, that's the rules and I can't think anything beyond that often times, so you know, I really think that that would help a lot.

Getting back to this dealing with the folks that are really affected by it, when I came onto this and I -- you know, I'm admittedly very new to minority business enterprise, DBE, external EEO, but I really made a full fledge effort to get a handle on it, to understand it, to understand the logic behind where we were going and I've been at this about nine months. The guidelines are very vague.

Okay. They say -- see if I can give you some examples. Well, we could go into a myriad of examples. They offer no examples of what does qualify, what doesn't qualify. Oh, yeah, there are cases. We could go and dig up jillions of cases, but there's no publication that tells you what the program is about, how it works, what is a qualifying organization, what isn't. There are no training programs. If, say Ed didn't know about this already and didn't get, you know, sort of the baptism of fire there's no course he could to go to learn about this stuff. There's no outreach program from the Federal program that

says, hey, how do you enforce this program.

What they do say is, oh, this State has a good program, or that State has a good program. Call them. Find out about that. What is this a random process. You know, it would help if there were real quidelines as to how to get this done. Where is your interpretation allowed and where isn't it.

What they do tell you is after you make a choice they'll be happy to second quess you after the fact. After you've certified a firm and a contractor has taken on the contract and he's engaged several subcontractors to do the job, they'll be happy to tell you that firm didn't qualify, but nothing up front to prevent all of that heartache in the beginning. So,I guess something that really lays out what those requirements are.

Now also these quidelines I have to personally object to some of them and I'll explain why. WBE interpretations are extremely discriminatory in my opinion. If I take on a -- if I look at a women's business enterprise application, if the husband has anything to do with that business and he has any skills related to that business at all then it's a front. I have to be completely chauvinistic about that. But where you bend over 18 ways to find where she does exert operational control.

The logic is she's just a wife. She couldn't possibly run that company and it happens all the time. If we get a case and she's got two years in the business and he's got eight and she might be the brains behind the organization, she might

make all the financing deals, all the bids, organize the company, keep that thing running, and if any of you all have run companies you know that that business knowledge is as critical to a business as long term success as is knowing how to pour concrete. We can't certify her. That's a family owned business. There's no way around that.

Native interpretations are discriminatory and I think insensitive to Alaska's unique considerations. Just this conflict that we have right now where the General Counsel for FHWA interprets on some very loose interpretations of the SBA working in that Surface Transportation Act have decided that if a Native individual owns a company, owns 51 percent, exerts operational control, has a commercial, useful function in that business then that's a certifiable DBE.

a shareholder, or a Native running that company that's not certifiable under their current interpretation. But we've not acted on this. We've got an AG's opinion that says that's highly questionable and I've got Barnhart's letter which says they are. He was talking about something else, but the last paragraph says they are and it's pretty clear. So, we've got some problems there.

There is also a wide variance of opinions so to what's the right way to go, or not (ph). Like take this Native interpretation again. I don't think the local FHWA -- now they're

probably not going to stand before this Committee and tell you this, but I don't think they support that opinion. The Regional folks do. D.C. does, but I don't know how many of those folks have ever been to Alaska. So, that's kind of difficult to deal with and -- and once again, they can have all this randomness of opinions but the person, or the people who are going to be dealing with the human beings effected is going to be us, and that's a very difficult situation to be in to make it the positive thing it ought to be. It becomes a big negative thing.

Sometimes, too, we run into -- for -- let's say for instance, external EEO, we have to run compliance reviews on those firms. We've had a very hard time meeting our goals this year. Two things entered into it. One is we were supposed to look at 10 companies and we have only a limited staff to do that.

The second is that we have a four month construction season and the idea is is that you're going to try to look at them somewhere in the peak of their operation so that you can really see who they've hired and who they haven't hired. And if you don't get that compliance review out by 30 days after it was done they won't accept it.

So now, we've got to do 10 companies with a limited staff over four months and do a good job at it. They'll second quess whether it met the qualifications or not, which aren't laid out as to what a good compliance review is and isn't. It's just that they'll know it when they see it. And none of that

is acceptable.

I mean, we didn't make the dates because of our construction season and so forth. That's a problem for us and it's a unique problem to Alaska because, well, the ground is going to be frozen in two more weeks and construction will stop.

And finally, I guess -- and this is maybe an advantage I offer because I didn't come in with any preconceived notions or know very much about the program when I walked in the door, maybe I was -- what do I want to say, naive, but I believe that the program was intended to make minorities and women -- to give them the opportunity to break into businesses that they didn't have the opportunity to get into before, because of one thing or another, especially in the construction industry where it was a very white, male oriented kind of a thing.

Now, you get kind of a chicken in the egg issue here. If you hadn't done all the work before, if you aren't all ready qualified to go out and start that business, you're not qualified for certification.

In other words, if you've only done, say, a year of striping and you worked for a bunch of other people and you've never run a company like that before, they might question whether you really know how to do the work you're trying to be certified for.

Now, an intelligent business person would hire other people that have that knowledge and they'd use 'em to get

that job done. Oh, no, that's a front, can't do that.

Same way if, for instance, in making a minority business enterprise, or a women's business enterprise work it requires good business knowledge to do it, we can't count that. If you're going to run a trucking company, but what you do mainly is you work out the bids, the scheduling, you work out the leases for the trucks, all of the business things that make or break a business, that doesn't count. You've got to go out and drive a truck. And those causes problems 'cause I don't think that really results in the end in a minority, or women's business enterprise really becomming successful.

You stop a lot of people before they ever get that extra competitive edge because the rules are you've got to all ready know how to do it.

Now if you've got to know all ready how to do it, and you haven't had an opportunity because you've been discriminated against, I'm not sure what to do. So, it's kind of a chicken and the egg problem.

That sort of ends my remarks. Thanks.

MR. ALEX: Okay. We have question. Yes, Charlie.

MS. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Wait a

minute. I'm going to ask my two little questions 'cause I have to

23 catch a plane.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. ALEX: Okay.

MR. ELDER: I yield to the airplane any day.

1	MS. WALKER: Thank you, Charlie Elder. Bob, I
2	can sympathize and empathize with you on the Federal Regs portion
3	of it. Aren't there some State Regs added on top of that or
4	don't we have some that we add to what we get from the Federal?
5	MR. POE: Not really. Not really.
6	MS. WALKER: None at all?
7	MR. POE: No. No.
8	MS. WALKER: Okay.
9	MR. POE: Do you have some examples in mind
10	'cause I don't think we do.
11	MS. WALKER: Yeah. I don't have time that's why
12	I t m
13	MR. POE: Okay. I'll be happy to talk
14	MS. WALKER: I asked the question, but
15	MR. POE: about it later, but I don't think
16	we do. I mean
17	MS. WALKER: Okay.
18	MR. POE: to my knowledge we don't.
19	MS. WALKER: All right. The other one the
20	other question that I wanted to ask publicly right now 'cause
21	you'll here from me again.
22	MR. POE: Right.
23	MS. WALKER: Now you mentioned the staff training
24	and so forth.
25	MR. POE: Um-hum.

2 provision for your staff training? 3 MR. POE: Well, no, we do and we work on -- in 4 fact one of the things Ed's going to do is work out programs in 5 terms of training of other folks and we do send them to training 6 courses and conferences and that sort of thing. Sure, we have 7 money for that. 8 MS. WALKER: Well, how stable is it? What I'm 9 saying is now everytime the administration changes all of the top 10 brass changes 11 Um-hum. MR. POE: 12 everything else changes, so MS. WALKER: 13 you get in a new group in here. Now these businesses, hopefully 14 will stay there 15 MR. POE: Um-hum. Um-hum. 16 year -- the following year no MS. WALKER: 17 matter who is in the office. Hopefully the business is going to 18 stay there, but they're going to have to deal with a fresh new 19 face every time the administration changes. Oh yeah. 20 MR. POE: The on- -- that's true, sure. 21 arguing that. 22 MS. WALKER: And this fresh new face has fresh 23 new ideas every time the administration changes, so where does that 24 put the individual? Is there any kind of a 25 MR. POE: Continuity?

MS. WALKER: The State does not have any

MS. WALKER: Yes.

MR. POE: Yeah, there certainly is. The only face that changed was me. I mean, Ed was brought on new. We created the position to make that happen, but the only new face is me.

MS. WALKER: No, this is this time, but I'm talking about

MR. POE: Well, I can't speak to any other time.

I can only speak to what I'm responsible for, but the only new face was me and actually what I confronted was nothing but complaints. Nobody liked the program at all in any way, shape, or form and what we've really tried to do is be responsive to changing, so you know, I would hope that the new face in this situation is a positive, not a negative. You're certainly going to have that. That's the beauty of government, or the terror of government, but that's the way it is.

There is continuity though. The overwhelming majority of that MBE and EEO staff are classified positions. They stay year after year. The certification listing that we have carries over year after year. All the people that work for Ed are classified, so really there isn't that hugh changeover that they have to face new people all the time.

Yes, I will give you the point that if an administration comes in that's not positive towards this program they could say, hey, you know, you guys lay off that, or you take

care of the AGC first and you worry about that program later, or 1 what have you. Those certainly aren't my orders. 2 MS. WALKER: One more question, Mr. Chairman. 3 MR. ALEX: Yes. 4 MS. WALKER: Is not DOT the largest recipient of 5 Federal funds in the State? 6 7 MR. POE: I would imagine so, sure. 8 MS. WALKER: Okay. Now how -- what is the 9 administrations feelings -- well, I shouldn't say administration. What is your feelings about the EEO taking part of your 10 responsibilities 11 (Fire alarm off) 12 MR. ALEX: We will be in recess until the fire 13 14 alarm or whatever it is goes away. 15 (Off Record) (On Record) 16 17 MR. ALEX: Okay. Since we have a time schedule 18 and we need to move along I'm sure that there are other questions 19 and I think, Charlie, you had some questions that you'd like to 20 ask. 21 MR. ELDER: Yeah. Mr. Poe, I am a little -- I'm 22 interested in your comments relating to your inability to get 23 certain Federal requirements satisfied because of the short 24 construction season, lack of help and all that 25 MR. POE: Um-hum, um-hum. Sure.

MR. ELDER: other crap we've heard from DOT 1 for years. What -- how do you define the construction season as 2 three months? 3 MR. POE: Four months. 4 MR. ELDER: Four. 5 MR. POE: Well, because that's what we really 6 experienced in terms of letting contracts and actual work. 7 here's the thing, what they want you to do when you pick the 8 companies is to try to get them during peak season. 9 That is when 10 their employment is the highest. And that happens in a very short picture of time. If you want to get representative projects. 11 Now, I won't sit here and argue that we don't have 12 work going on beyond that window, but the lion's share where the 13 really hiring goes on, where the real opportunities for 14 15 affirmative action happen is during that short period of time. 16 That's reality. That's what we do in terms of letting contracts 17 out, in terms of getting bid work ready. We had to hit that narrow construction season, and maybe I'd offer the reason you 18 19 hear that from DOT regularly is that's the truth. 20 MR. ELDER: Well, I understand the window very 21 well, but I don't see that that prevents you from meeting Federal 22 requirements.

MR. POE: Well, what prevents us is we have three people, really two and a half people that do it. They've got 10 companies to do. There's no specifications on what a satisfactory

23

24

into them within 30 days of doing it. Now we just get buried with 2 3 the paper work. The best way to understand it would be to try 4 one yourself. 5 MR. ELDER: I have. 6 MR. POE: Okay. 7 MR. ELDER: And we did it. 8 MR. POE: Well, as I understand it right now we're 9 not able to. 10 MR. ELDER: Right. 11 MR. POE: I have to admit I haven't done it. 12 MR. ELDER: Okay. Now 13 MR. POE: But that's the best as I understand 14 right now and it -- I worked out 15 MR. ELDER: You're identifying -- you're putting 16 too much weight on the peak season, I think. 17 MR. POE: Well, I sat down with Willy Harris the 18 Regional FHWA director in the MBE area and Civil Rights area and 19 they do, they want 10 projects during that peak area. Now, they 20 offer a little bit of flexibility. You know, you get 'em maybe 21 during start-up a little bit more than at the top of the curve in 22 terms of the employment population for that particular job, but 23 it really happens in a narrow window. 24 Now we--after that conversation with them which 25 was about two weeks ago, we are looking at ways that we can

compliance review looks like and you have to have that done and

stagger it and things like that, and so we are trying to comply. And I didn't come under the delusion that because I told you that it was hard for us that you were going to wave your wand and things were going to get easier for us, so we are trying to stagger it. I've looked at scheduling ways that we can pull it off, but I think also there needs to be some realism relative to Alaska's construction season and relative to other states. And I don't think that there's that appreciation.

I know down South that they get tired of us always saying Alaska is different, but facts are Alaska is different.
So

MR. ALEX: All right. Gil, you had. Then Arliss.

MR. GUITIERREZ: I just got -- you laid out a

list of things that were very difficult to deal with. I was

wondering what kinds of positive things, or easy things are you

guys taking on right now and actually developing things (ph)

meanwhile (ph)?

MR. POE: Okay. Ed, would you like to tell 'em?

MR. RAMIREZ: Well, one of the things that I'm

focusing on, or different -- or -- that I'm focusing on -- on

what I'm doing for the DBWB (ph) program is I feel that educating

the public is very important in the program.

I believe that in the past there has not been this public relations, this opportunity for the director or his staff to go out into the community and say, hey, let's have a

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

workshop, let's have a seminar, let's have some newsletters out, do something to educate the public as to how the program is run.

A lot of times we have a lot of people that call, that send in applications that know nothing about the program and that's just an overabundance of more and more and more paper work because people, especially people from bush areas, or even in Anchorage, Fairbanks, you know, the -- the -- where you have the most of the population, they come in thinking that they can -- they own 51 percent of the company, they feel that they can -- they'll be certified. That is not the case and the reason is that they don't know what the program is all about and that's my number one focus, is going out into the community throughout the State, throughout the bush areas and holding seminars, workshops, sending out newsletters to the primes, to the subcontractors, handbooks, anything that will educate them on what the program is all about. And that hasn't been done in the past and -- and I'm really going to be working towards that end.

MR. ALEX: Arliss.

MR. ELDER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: All right, Charlie.

MR. ELDER: Ed, how long have you been with the

Department?

MR. RAMIREZ: I've been there about three and a half months, three and a half months there.

MR. ELDER: Thank you.

MR. ALEX: Yeah, Arliss.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman -Mr. Commissioner. It's kind of interesting, I am a great note
taker and I came out with about eight, or nine things all pretty
specific, coordination among Federal programs, guidelines,
differences between region/local people and so on. As Mr. Ramirez
has said, my question is going to be very much like Gil's
obviously. Okay. You've got all that kind of a problem. What's
going to happen?

Now, the program that Mr. Ramirez is talking about which sounds excellant should better educate people so that perhaps you'll cut down some of your paper work. You'll not have perhaps quite as many false expectations, but those things do absolutely nothing really, or do very little toward the one through eight, or one through nine of the problems that you're facing on the Federal level. And we have seen time and time again over the years a program that has caused great controversy with the very people out there which is the contracting community that has to make the bloody thing work whether you're a subcontractor who happens to be a minority firm or not.

So I guess the question would be what happens on the other end? You can educate, but you're still going to have that problem of you taking steps, say, to certify, getting a person on the job, having the Feds come along and say, hey, that person doesn't qualify. So, you're not really addressing some of

those endemic problems that make the programs not work. Okay. So, something has to be done there. If you've got a problem in Alaska, 49 other states probably have a problem too, and is there some kind of a conserted approach that goes from your very worthy effort in education to some of those endemic problems, 'cause that's what you focused on, Bob, every single one, you know?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. POE: Sure. Sure. Well, and actually after talking to Mr. Dulles that's what I understood was sort of the topic today, rather than to present the program.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Sure. No, but we'd like some solutions, too.

MR. POE: Sure. I think -- let me propose some I think for one -- I think the Federal program ought solutions. to do exactly what Ed's doing. We're going to try to lay out to folks who don't understand the program why the program exists, what it's there for, what it takes to qualify, what services exists to help you qualify. We're trying to make the process of certification a more due process sort of situation. A lot of the complaints -- all the appeals go to me, I got a lot of complaints, They never ask me more than just the they never talk to me. If they'd ever ask me about these things, you'd know I'd be certified, that sort of thing. So, I think that if the Federal government set out and said, okay, let's stop talking about the issue, let's lay out what the requirements are.

Now, they'll tell you the requirements are laid out, but I don't really think they are. Let's show examples. Let's prepare a course that every supportive services manager in a DOT across the state has to go to and to learn what it is that they're going to set up as a national standard to do it. Let's put some funds to that. If you want to manage

Let me give an example. One of my responsibilities is to clean up the accounting situation at DOT. Okay. Now -- and that's moving along quite well.

One of the major -- and this don't sound very major, but one of the major things I did, is I said, hey, guys we have only one accounting system, that's the State accounting system. I don't care what's on the back of your envelope, those numbers are the only numbers that are right. If they're wrong, let's fix them, but don't tell me that you're envelope is right and the numbers are wrong. So they said, well, I don't know how to use that accounting system. It cost the State 14 million dollars for the contractor when he cut the budget, what they cut was training.

The very first -- second day on the job we developed a training course for that accounting system. I don't expect those people to get their act together in accounting if they don't know how to use the tool. If I want to provide a consistency of knowledge across all of these organizations in DOT I've got to train them. So one, let's have a program that sets

out the requirements and may -- brings everybody up to level.

Instead of comparing States and having everybody go through this complaint stuff, let's provided some consistency. Let's spell out in writing, in writing, let me underline that -- in writing what it takes to do that.

I have a very difficult time getting them to put down what they say to me in a meeting down on a letter. For one, I think that would help a lot.

Two is, I think that FHWA and FAA and BIA and the other Federal organizations should get together as we're trying to do. We're not there yet, but there's been talk of a consortium effort which I believe Mr. Casey is going to speak to later on, where we're trying to coordinate DOT and the Municipality of Anchorage and City and Borough of Juneau and we will be working on that this next year to see if we can do something along those lines. Well, it might make sense if BIA and FAA and FHWA sat down and said, hey, let's make this program consistent across all agencies.

Paper work, let's take a took at maybe some of our model programs. Say -- I hear oftentimes, what is it, Maryland, the State of Maryland is offered as a good example. I think Oregon is oftentimes, Washington. Let's look at what those folks do and we're trying to, but it might help if on a state-wide -- or on a U. S.-wide level they did that sort of thing.

And when we're doing outreach, those folks, those

1

4 5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

2324

25

contractors you mentioned, Senator, that are trying to deal with the situation, and really are. I mean, 85, 90 percent of those folks are going their best to deal with it. Maybe it would make sense — they know it's a Federal program. Maybe it would make sence if the Federal Government also went out and tried to do some outreach to those folks and tried to explain the program and why and answered those questions directly.

What I find myself in a situation doing, is saying, well, the FHWA tells me such and such. And they say, well, rah -- rah -- rah, rah, you know, you should fix that. I don't know how to fix that. I think maybe if they heard it and they tried to deal with it and maybe took proactive action to fix that, that might be a positive.

I think there are a lot of things that they could do. I think most of them require just facing up to what you're trying to do in the program and taking some proactive measures to cause that to happen. Does that pretty much answer the question, or

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman. You know, it's a classic case of a circular kind of nondecision making and --

MR. POE: Yeah, a lot of pointing.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: and so I just sit here and I -- internally I just get all tensed up, because if that's all we ever do is go around; we have all of the anger among

groups that oughtn't to be angry at each other. ACG and the minority contractors should not be fighting. Obviously it becomes even more distressed when the construction dollars are down, but it doesn't do any good either for us to say that's the problem over there unless we can engage ourselves in finding an answer.

And I would hope

MR. POE: Well, and Senator

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. STURGULEWSKI: we can point out, you know, some of those things to the Federal agencies. And that's the whole reason behind the Region 10 approach is to coordinate problems. And so something is breaking down if everybody is going out and doing their little thing, but not addressing some of those problems.

MR. POE: And Senator, if I could just add, the actions we've taken with Ed's program which we're -- and Ed and I went over the work plan today and, you know, we're -- and

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Very -- very positive it's sounds (ph).

MR. POE: And they are and they're really starting to happen. And one of the tests that I use is when I first walked into the job I had on average 10 complaints a week, you know, phone calls, calls from legislators, or something on appeals on MBE certifications. People who felt they got a raw deal. I have maybe one, two a month now. But -- and so we are trying to take action and we're not saying we're not going to do the program

2	Mr. Dulles on the phone my understanding was that this was an
3	opportunity to express our concerns about how it works with the
4	Federal government and and that one of the purposes of this
5	Committee was to communicate back some of those concerns, so
6	that's really why I came in with such a negative bent. I don't
7	usually do that, but I understood I this was an opportunity
8	to air problems and that's what I tried to do.
9	MS. STURGULEWSKI: Mr. Chairman?
10	MR. ALEX: Yes.
11	MS. STURGULEWSKI: Just one final thing in
12	response, but if we can also have those positive things so if we
13	can help you help yourself that's
14	MR. POE: Sure.
15	MS. STURGULEWSKI: that's great.
16	MR. POE: Sure.
17	MR. ALEX: Gil?
18	MR. GUITIERREZ: I just have one more question
19	here. As I understand it then the way the Feds interpreted the
20	rules and regulations is very narrow, and the way the State
21	interprets it is attempting to expand those so that they can
22	implement a program, is that what I hear you saying?
23	MR. POE: Not exactly. (Simultaneous - speech) -
24	Yeah, we we're trying. Okay. We but see we're working
25	with a very narrow line and that's that line that you push where

because there are these problems. But when I spoke with

1 |

they won't come back later and say that firm shouldn't have been certified. So as an example, let's say there's a situation where we're concerned about operational control, but we believe the person really is doing it and has the background and so forth, then we would ask to go back in six months and revisit that company. So what we'll do is take a risk and say we'll go with you for six months, but we want to go back and look at it and make sure that you're -- you are exerting operational control. That somebody else isn't exercising undue control in your company.

I've been bruised a little bit about that. I mean, folks have come back and said that guy didn't know what he was doing, you know, and he shouldn't be doing that. That's a risky proposition, but I really believe we've got to try, where you think the risk is justified, to help folks become viable enterprises.

On the other hand, we don't want a situation where after the job is done and they've used that minority business contractor, that that contractor will be disallowed for goal making and we'll get in a suite with a contractor and the contractor who acted in good faith is in a bad way too. So it's - we're working on that line, but it's not an easy one to push.

MR. GUITIERREZ: The other question I guess is how are goals set up now? I mean, what kind of

MR. RAMIREZ: Goals are set by funding source. In other words, the contract itself. How much of a contract do you

1 see 2 of 3 hi 4 of 5 th 6 so 7 ur 8 su 9 ge 10 ma 11 1c 12 Ar 13 es

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

set aside for goals. It's by funding source. The availability of the minority contractors. Usually the goals are set a little higher in the urban areas more so than in the bush areas because of the availability of DBE's, WBE's out there. Most of the time the jobs in the bush areas are not as high as the urban areas, so you can't set goals high in the bush areas like you do in the There's no way, because it would cost a urban areas. subcontractor to take equipment and everything that he needs to get the job done, it would cost him more than what he would be making in the bush areas. So, for that reason the goals were set lower in the bush areas then they are in say, Fairbanks, Anchorage, Kenai peninsula. But we always get complaints, you know, especially from the AGC, saying your goals are too high. we get it from the other side, the sub is saying the goals are too low.

MR. POE: Or now that the DBE goal is combined, minority business enterprises say don't include those women in there. And we won't -- you know, and we won't get our 10 percent. We'll only get, you know, some other percent. And then I get letters from women's groups that say make ours higher. You know, everybody wants the opportunity if they can and, you know, so we -- we're right now doing our best to meet the 12 percent combined.

MR. ALEX: Yeah. John?

MR. DULLES: Would one constructive suggestion be to bring in all of these various affected parties into the

decision making process? This gets back to Gil's question, how are the goals set, not how does Ed set them, or Bob Poe set them, but isn't there some means by which you could broaden that decisionmaking basis so therefore AGC, the unions, the subcontractors, the various organizations would all have a role in setting the specific goals for each individual project? So you'd involve them in the process and therefore they would buy into it and therefore they would participate in the operation of the program. Is that worth some consideration?

MR. POE: Well, I was listening to it as you said it and the first thing I envisioned is 300 projects or so and we go through this every time we have a project, you know, and like I say they all happen very quickly.

On the other hand, I could envision some board that sets the goal.

MR. DULLES: Some advisory committee?

MR. POE: Yeah. Yeah, I think that might have some merit. I'd be certainly willing to look at it. It's the first I've heard of an idea like that and I think I'd be happy to look at that. Yeah.

MR. ALEX: Further questions? I -- I -- actually I've saved a question or two. One of the things that I'd heard and, you know, I heard this several times over the summer, is that something that is an actual practice is something called bid shopping. And prime contractors practice bid shopping and, you

3

4

5

6 7

8

10

9

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

you, what if anything do you know about it and how can that be solved?

MR. POE: They do practice bid shopping. Every contractor does, whether it's minority subs, or non-minority subs. They're going to see who will give them the best price.

The one thing that can be done about this is that you don't allow bid shopping after the award is made. In other words, if you shopped up to making your bid then that's what you're tied to.

Now, there was action on the procurement bill. I believe there was some additional action last session, and certainly there was lobbying to make that length of time that bids could still be sought after the award and AGC wanted to push that as long as possible and other folks wanted to push it as tight as possible. I believe it's -- is it three days now?

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Seventy-two hours it seems to me. There was

MR. POE: Seventy-two hours, yeah. Yeah.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. But there was a lot of debate about that and there needs to be some time, because you may have, you know, contacted a number before, but many people want that longer. And I think that one of the worse cases we ever saw went on literally for weeks and it happened to be an out of the country contractor. I think you perhaps know the job I'm talking about. And there were just --

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

1

it was so man -- the public was so riled up about that it
was addressed legislatively. But I don't know whether that
provision has gone into effect because we put aside the conditions
of that particular legislation, so is that in effect, or not?

MR. POE: No. No, Senator

MS. STURGULEWSKI: I don't -- I don't think it is.
I think I'm correct.

MR. POE: you're correct. It's not in effect until January. And at that time

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Yeah.

MR. POE: those procurement regulations go into effect. And so that is one action that can take place.

We also -- in fact I went up to Fairbanks to visit with a group of Black contractors who wanted to bring up some of their issues, and one that they brought up was bid shopping.

Another that will happen is you'll call up for the bid and then what they'll do is they'll show up and then you use some device to say you're not qualified to do the work and you send them home. And that way you say you made a good faith effort, but there just weren't any subs, minority firms that could do it. And so you say I made a good faith effort to meet my goal, but he didn't have the right equipment and he wasn't qualified to do the job and so forth. And really that takes — that's where staff comes into play to really get out there and watch the jobs. Ed does a lot of site visits and that's the kind

1 of stuff we watch for and we'll be watching for this next 2 construction season heavily, but that's another device that's 3 used. 4 MR. ALEX: Further questions? Yeah, John? 5 MR. DULLES: Could you for the record provide us 6 with a copy of your work plan? 7 MR. POE: Um-hum. 8 MR. DULLES: Your current MBE program, some 9 statistics that would reflect your success in meeting goals and 10 other documentation. 11 MR. POE: And certainly, Mr. Dulles Sure. 12 MR. DULLES: You can send them to us if you like. 13 MR. POE:you know, FHWA requires regular 14 reporting on that, and so does FAA. So there's a heap of 15 documentation available with them and we'd be happy to provide, 16 you know, what we have, but we -- we provide the Federal 17 government regularly all that stuff. And the work plan would be 18 a good start and then maybe you could tell us specifically what 19 you wanted to see then. 20 I mean, I'm not being resistant, it's just 21 MR. DULLES: Well, the troubling portion of all 22 of this frankly to me is it's very clear that this is nothing 23 but administering a federally initiated programs; that there's 24 very little that's really meaningful with respect to State 25 initiatives. You're responding to a Federal program and there's

a great deal of hands on management from the Federal government. 1 2 3 5 6

8 9

7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

Maybe second guessing and it -- what it's doing is basically making this nothing but a compliance problem for the State of Alaska, as opposed to a State initiative to try to assist minority and women businesses. Not -- that's -- in other words that the genesis of this is really Federal law and Federal regulation and that is frustrating and it's disappointing, 'cause that's not where the emphasis ought to be.

MR. POE: I'd offer to you too, though, that in Alaska we have a very important State initiative that focuses on hiring Alaskans. And we have some problems that we're not able to deal with at all on the Federal side and actually we were working hard to deal with a complex set of problems and we do have State support of this. You know, I have support from the highest level to follow up on it. What I talked to you about, though, is how it was to deal with the Federal requirements of this. This is something that the Federal government set up and we're trying to follow the rules. We get the money from them.

MR. DULLES: Is there some way of bringing them into the process so that in --

MR. POE: They're in the process every day.

MR. DULLES: in setting up -- no, no, between you and the Federal highway people, it's on a daily basis. Open up the process.

MR. POE: It all ready is. We speak with

Bob Ruby all the time. 1 2 MR. DULLES: Hold a work shop, hold a training 3 session, bring the Federal people in so that they are required 4 and forced to respond to the questions and the concerns and the 5 inquiries of the contractors and of the business community. 6 MR. POE: Well, we -- in our outreach we 7 certainly plan to do that and, for instance, as an example, we 8 offered a proposal to the FHWA to ask one of their members to be 9 a member of the certification review team, sit on every single 10 case and certify. They said that wouldn't be appropriate and 11 they wouldn't have time. 12 MR. ALEX: Any further questions? 13 MR. POE: Thank you very much, appreciate the 14 opportunity. 15 Thank you, Bob, Ed. MR. ALEX: 16 MR. RAMIREZ: Thank you. 17 MR. ALEX: Up next is Vince Casey, Director of 18 Equal Opportunity Program, Municipality of Anchorage. Because 19 we have a court reporter we'd like you to -- you know, when you 20 start off to state your name and position, Vince? 21 Thank you. My name is Vince Casey MR. CASEY: 22 and I'm the manager of the Office of Equal Opportunity for the 23 Municipality of Anchorage. And to my right is Sharon Roberds of 24 the same office, who is the statistician.

25

If I may, I would just like to briefly point out

what I think are the important points of the Municipality of Anchorage's minority and women's business enterprise program.

We do have an ordinance and regulation that indicates how the program will be set up and who is responsible for it and who will set the goals. I brought copies of the ordinance and regulations as well.

I think probably the most important component of the program is certification. And I didn't get to hear all the previous presentation, and I don't want to duplicate too much of that, but we do adhere to the Federal regulations as strictly as we can. And I must say initially when the program was started out some years ago, that anyone applying was granted certification recognition as a minority, or women owned business.

And then in 1985, I believe it was, when I came aboard, and the Mayor called me one day and said, I have not seen minority subcontractors on that particular project across the street. And I said, well, it's interesting you should call and say that, Mr. Mayor, because the business that you're looking at down there now is supposed to be Black owned, but you and I know that the person down there with the white hair is the owner. But they are certified in our directory and so I cannot criticize the prime contractor for not hiring minority contractors.

And so at that point we went about auditing our directory of certified businesses and we have just about completed that. It's been taking quite some time because also each year

our staff has been reduced.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When we certify businesses we list them in a directory the same as the State does and we make this directory available to the prime contractors and whomever wishes to have it.

I'll skip onto goal setting now. Certainly the plan that the Federal government requires us to submit and we have to indicate what our overall goal is each year, once you submit the plan you just update the goals annually.

Our goals at the time are 10 percent minority and three percent of women.

Our ordinance gives the minority business enterprise officer the responsibility to establish those goals overall for the year, as well as goals for individual projects.

In establishing goals we have the estimating engineers to identify the scope of work and the components of the project, be it a construction, or an RFP, and list in this particular section right here, the possibly subcontracting opportunities. And over in this column the dollar amount of that particular component.

Then they submit that to our office. It's treated as confidential information and we compare those components to the minority and women subcontractors that we have certified to see if we have them that can provide those services, or products that they say are possibly subcontracted.

Once we do that, then we determine whether we're

R & R COURT REPORTERS

going to have 10 percent minority, three percent women goals.

Sometimes I've set as high as 15 percent minority and five

percent. Sometimes I have higher women's goals than I do

minority goals because of those opportunities available.

Sometimes there are no opportunities available and that's the

reason we have higher than 10/3 when the opportunity is available

to try to reach our overall goal.

Once we establish the goals, we weekly mail out a newsletter to each business that's listed in the directory listing the contracting opportunities that are coming out of purchasing, those that have goals established to them, or attached to them, as well as those that do not have goals.

Once the bids are submitted, the contractor, the low bidder, I should say, now has three Municipal work days to submit our form, what we call the NBE-5, and on this they name the subcontractor they're going to use, the total dollar amount that they are going to pay them for that work, and whether or not they're a local contractor, and the work that they're supposed to perform, and indicate whether or not -- or which they're using them towards, their minority goal, or their women's goal.

Once we receive that, we used to pretty much contact all of those listed subcontractors to confirm that commitment and the dollar figure. In the beginning we found out that a lot of them had not even been contacted, and so that caused primary -- prime contractors to start cleaning up their acts.

But we also at that time decided because minorities and women said that they were bid shopping them, we made it a requirement that they submit this as part of the bid, and we did that for a year and a half. And, as I said, our staff has continuously been cut and we started having a lot of litigation and we weren't able to keep up, and so we did acquiesce and go back to the three days.

To be frank with you, that has not worked out too well, because there are other components of the government that are supposed to help us enforce that, and that three days has not necessarily been enforced the way it should have been -- should be.

When prime contractors do not meet the goal established, or set on the project, then they're required to show us in writing how they did go about seeking minority and women subcontractors. And, if they demonstrate what we call good faith effort, then we can go ahead and approve that bid, even though they did not meet the goals.

We have on several occasions found that they did not demonstrate a good faith effort. We've gone to court, I think, four times and won the first three cases and lost the fourth one and that's the only one that made the paper, so it was a little embarrassing and

In reaching this stage of the program we had thought we were being considerate because we had prime contractors who reported to us that minorities and women business had

misrepresented themselves as being certified. I felt that I was being very fair by allowing them to replace them with certified businesses, but the judge interpreted that I was not being consistent and was arbitrary and capricious and so we didn't make it.

There are other extenuating circumstances. I held up a five million dollar contract for two months because of one of the subcontractors who was related to the prime contractors. The validation of one of their certification said that one of their parents was a minority and we called the State in the Lower 48 where they were certified and the records on file in the State document's office indicated that both parents were non-minority. But the Federal agency that was funding 75 percent of this project for some reason some time had certified this outfit and we're not too concerned about them meeting our 10/3 goal, and so we did acquiesce to a seven percent minority, and I think two or three percent women's participation goal.

I've told you how we contact the subcontractors to verify their dollar amount and participation. At the end of the year we contact the contractors and see if they -- you know, when the project is through, if they did get the dollar amount and did get to perform. And, sometimes we have found that they didn't even get to perform. It was given to someone else and that's a violation of our ordinance.

What we're trying to implement at this time, and

since we're having a change of administration I don't know if
we'll be successful, we're trying to require that the project
manager be the monitoring force and that the primes be required
to submit their utilization reports of minority and women to the
project manager who will then forward it onto our office. If it's
satisfactory we're trying to get the -- I forget the name of the
form that the departments have to sign off to release progress
payments, or final payment, we're trying to get our office as part
of the sign off process there. And if they have not met these
requirements, then we would not sign off. And we think this is -you know, it could be effective, and because we've been reduced in
staff, it also would be efficient.

That's kind of what I think I wanted to say about the program. You wanted some suggestions, I've just made a few here. I think that there ought to be some -- you're talking about education, some kind of government assistance, and I didn't say which level, to assist minorities and women with bonding and insurance problems.

Our plan, the Municipality of Anchorage, says that the Municipality will break down projects which will enhance opportunities for minorities and women to bid, because we do not require a performance and payment bond if the project is estimated 100,000 dollars or under, but the Municipality is not doing that. It's making bigger projects, you know, and I'm not ratting, I'm just telling you the facts.

Number three, I think that we should -- we being the government, should monitor and pass on positive remarks when they're due about the performance of minority and the women contractors, because we're not in a position to say whether or not an individual business can produce, or perform. However, we know that prime contractors are.

I also think that there should be some monitoring because I'm sure that there are prime contractors who harass minority and women businesses and make them have to redo their work, which is quite expensive, and they don't make any money when they get the bid.

I've seen prime contractors get a bid and give it to a non-minority contractor who couldn't get bonding and insurance, and I've told them, you know, they can do the samething for minorities, and that's what the program is about.

I think Mr. Poe and Mr. Ramirez mentioned that we had been negotiating with them to try to coordinate what we do so we wouldn't be duplicating one another's effort because we feel that it would be more efficient use of the taxpayers dollars and better service to the businesses as well.

My final remark is that if I could convince minority and women businesses, they would band together and hire a business agent who would be their advocate, because many of them know of violations but are afraid to report them because they are fearful that they will be drummed out of business.

MR. ALEX: Gil?

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

MR. GUITIERREZ: Mr. Casey, I was wondering, we know that the funds come from the feds through the State

Department of Transportation to the project. How do the funds from the city move so that you could more-or-less figure out how much the project is going to be? Could you explain that? I'm not sure exactly -- I mean, I know you set goals, but I'm not sure exactly how the process

MR. CASEY: This confidential information form, we require the department that's going to be sending advertising and invitation to bid on a project to tell us the estimated dollar amount of that project. And also, as I've mentioned, the components that could possibly be subcontracted.

MR. GUITIERREZ: Okay. But what if -- let's say you're -- we build a lot of roads around Anchorage. Do those monies come from the Federal Highway Administration, or do they come from the city coffers, or

MR. CASEY: We require them to identify where they come from. Some of it comes from Federal money and so forth. Those, as I said, projects under 100,000 we do not require performance and payment bond, so we historically have not set goals on those unless Federal funds are involved. Then we do try to set goals on those under 100,000.

MR. ALEX: Yes, Mitch.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Sir, you've recommended that some

level of government get involved in making bonds available for minorities and women's businesses. Have you found that -- or are there statistics to support the notion that there is a pattern of discrimination by bonding agencies when it comes to bonding women and minority businesses?

MR. CASEY: Well, I certainly don't have any

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

money or staff to go out and do a study. I guess historically it's happened. I've also had personnel who have worked for me who have previously worked for bonding agencies and have reported to me that they practice discrimination. That's the best answer I can give you.

I didn't say that I felt that government should -I didn't quite -- I -- I said that they should provide some
assistance in helping them get insurance and bonding.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Thank you.

MR. ALEX: Questions? Further questions?

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: Yes, Arliss.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: I guess this is a comment in response to the last question. That issue of bonding and insurance has engendered a lot of legislative looking over the years and unfortunately most of the bonds are equivalent almost to cash bonds. You've got to have money before you get a bond and if you've got the money, you know -- I mean, it's circular. And the discussion has kind of come down at the end saying that

if you assist people who -- again getting back to that question 1 2 of having experience and all the rest, and they don't have it and yet you're allowing them to get into the business you may be 3 4 doing more of a disservice, so it's very, very difficult to 5 reach from that point of view of saying minimizing their -- the 6 need for bonds and so on. So I -- I don't know, maybe education 7 in how to go about it, how to present financial statements, the 8 kind of things that is somewhat available through the State. The Small Business Development Corporation and so on, may fulfill that 10 So, it may be working with other agencies to help people get the 11 kind of knowledge that they need in small businesses. 12 I guess my question to you, Vince, would be 13 in spite of the problems and so on, do you feel you're effective 14 in getting minority businesses get a part of the pie? 15 MR. CASEY: I felt that I was. I'd like to go

MR. CASEY: I felt that I was. I'd like to go back to your remarks about bonding if I could first.

I think that what it takes is strong leadership.

As I said before, prime contractors are assisting -- non-minority prime contractors are assisting non-minority subcontractors starting up in business by providing them bonding and

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Um-hum. Bonding -- umbrella bonding.

MR. CASEY: insurance -- and insurance. Yes.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Yeah.

MR. CASEY: And they can do the same thing for

R & R COURT REPORTERS

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

minorities

5

MS. STURGULEWSKI: You bet.

MR. CASEY: if they want to, but even -let's say that one wanted to, they probably are fearful that
they are going to be chastised by their peers. And so when I
say strong leadership, I mean like Brant Rictors (ph) who brought
Jackie Robinson into baseball, et cetera.

As far as being effective in assisting minorities with getting contracting opportunities, yes, and I said, up to a point. I think that -- as I look back now I think it was more effective when we required them to -- them being the bidders, to submit the names of the minotiry and women subcontractors that they were going to use as part of the bid.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Um-hum.

MR. CASEY: There are -- there were some problems there because there are some minorities and women who said I know you've got to have a minority, or women, and so here's my bid, which in some cases would be much higher than it should be. So it is a two way problem. There is some education required, you know.

But the problem is to make it more effective, we need more staff and more paper work. We should require prime contractors to share all of their subcontracts with us and then we could compare their subcontracts with non-minorities, with those with minorities and women and I think that would be quite

enlightening.

5

MR. ALEX: Yes, John.

MR. DULLES: Have you had the same history of problems dealing with the Federal government that Mr. Poe indicated the DOT at the State level has had? You heard his comments. What is your comparable experience?

MR. CASEY: I wasn't too smart, I was sitting in the back and I couldn't hear that well. Would you briefly

MR. DULLES: Oh, well. He was quite critical of the Federal government's administration of the MBE program. I just wondered what your experience was dealing with the Federal agencies that you report to, or that you deal with?

MR. CASEY: Well, they have not policed us perhaps as much as they have the State. I guess I look at the politicians being more of a problem than I do the Federal government. The regs that we received just this week, combining women and minority goals as one, certainly is detrimental to minorities because part of the problem as I mentioned in certification is that so many non-minority businesses decided out of love that they would give the business to their non-minority wives. And those non-minority women that are certified now can be used towards meeting the total goal. And there's no portion for minorities to get. And it's the result -- you know, I heard somebody talking about the -- we did have some meetings going with ACG representatives for minority and women contractors here.

There's an AGC conference going on right now that we wanted to 1 attend. We were making progress because they told them, you know, what they need to do is sit down and come to come agreement about 3 how we go about meeting the goal and how we go about validating 4 good faith effort. 5 Well, on a National level AGC is against their 6 program. And I have a tape where a gentleman came and said they 7 were taking out full page ads against the program, and so this 8 change in the goal setting and so forth is the result of that. 9 MR. DULLES: Does this mean that a municipality 10 can meet its goals by hiring exclusively non-minorities and still 11 meet its DBE goals? 12 MR. CASEY: Towards those -- the municipality, or 13 State, either one, towards those DOT funded projects, but that's 14 one of the things that I have consistently said, you know, that 15 we should on non-federally assisted projects continue to have 16 minority and women goals and that's what we're doing thus far. 17 MR. DULLES: So the city does have its own 18 ordinances 19 MR. CASEY: Yes. 20 MR. DULLES: so that your program is 21 22 applicable to all programs, or all contracts under the Municipality? 23 MR. CASEY: Yes. 24

25

MR. DULLES: Regardless of funding source?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CASEY: Yes. You know, it's -- and we talked about education and this year -- this past year we've had -- we've tried to get into the RFP because historically, you know, like I said, minorities and women can't do that and -- and just today I convinced a utility. You know, I said, we have some minorities that consistently after we advertise with no goals say that there are subcontracting opportunities. And I said because I don't know that they're there and you don't know that they're there doesn't mean that they're not there. And so what we agreed to do today is to require the bidders to identify subcontracting opportunities as part of the bid and once we get that, if they do identify some, then we will set a goal and negotiate that into the contract.

I think there are a lot of ways to get the job done if people want to do it and you hang in there.

MR. DULLES: And then finally on certification,
Mr. Ramirez is certifying, you're certifiying, the City of Juneau
is certifying. Is there a cross certification process, or how
does it work? Do they have to separately apply for each
different

MR. CASEY: Well -- yes, because I think each --

MR. DULLES: level of

MR. CASEY: each certification unit some times gets more information than the other and perhaps will deny certification because of that information while another government

certify and so I that's the reason we don't have an on going 1 2 reciprocity situation. MR. DULLES: Well, would that be a good thing to 3 4 have? 5 MR. CASEY: Yes, if everybody certified the same 6 was. 7 MR. DULLES: But that's not likely to be achieved 8 any time soon from what you're 9 MR. CASEY: Well, I -- I think that we're getting 10 much closer to it. 11 MR. ALEX: Further questions? I have a question. 12 MR. CASEY: Okay. 13 Back a number of months ago it was MR. ALEX: 14 reported in the paper that the ombudsmen had cited the 15 Municipality for deletion of minority portions on the performing 16 arts center. Do you have anything to speak on in that issue? 17 MR. CASEY: Well, the performing arts center has 18 been a problem for everyone. There were some contracts that they 19 did delete the goals. You know, you just have to acknowledge when 20 you're working with government, you're working with politicians. 21 I didn't believe that the Assembly would approve negotiating 22 contracts. Once that was approved then I didn't know who was 23 contracting and -- or anything, and so there were no goals set. 24 You know, we didn't have any idea what dollar amount and so forth. 25 And supposedly the officials responsible for that were reporting

5

6 7

8

10

11

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

2324

25

that they were meeting minority goals, but they weren't checking with us to see if those so called minority businesses were certified and some of them weren't, because I would get calls from other businesses that someone we had denied certification was there working as a minority business, and so it -- it was a problem. Is a problem.

MR. ALEX: Any further questions. No, I guess, we're done. Well, thank you, Vince. And I think one thing we probably ought to do since we -- this morning we had a little problem with continuity -- people wanting a little bit of break I think right now would be an opportunity to take about a 10 minute break.

(Off Record)

(On Record)

MR. ALEX: Why don't we get going again. Okay. We have Don Barlow from the NAACP and we'd like to invite him up. We are expecting Earlene Caress from the Alaska Association of Subcontractors, but in the meantime we'll go with Don. Don, welcome.

MR. BARLOW: Upon being officially notified of the conducting of this particular hearing, I felt somewhat excited by idea in that I have been recently made more aware of on going concerns relative to MBE and WBE.

The concerns which I believe are not new concerns, but reoccurring concerns really aren't the concerns that I

3

4

5

7

6

9

8

11

10

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

2324

25

heard voiced today from various officials.

The concerns that I've heard I will now make reference to, education, informing, perhaps assisting various MBE's to acquire bonding which is, I believe, important and at times a problem, really aren't the major hurtles as I am of the opinion of and have been made aware of by qualified individuals who desire to participate in acquiring not only contracts, but employment.

Now I understand the employment conponent would be addressed by EEO, yet I do see a correlation between the Federal monies which are being directed and made available for use and the need to insure that there are minorities involved in those processes.

But relative to the MBE, WBE, I think it's important to note that there is a large -- there are significant numbers of qualified people who are being denied opportunity to participate. I'm not so sure that it's a result of a complex structure of regulations, or a lack of ability to understand those regulations, as much as it is a less than honest attempt to involved those individuals.

The term good intention, or good faith effort has been used earlier this afternoon. That is highly suggestive of a number of things and it comes down to your personal interpretation of that. Yet I find the suggestion of that offensive in that I'm not convinced that honest effort and good

intents are good enough, especially if -- if when Federal monies are directed and made available for specific usages that complying should be waived in the name of good intent, but no comers, so to speak.

I am aware of one project where the statement was made that minority contractors tend to shy away from projects of this magnitude in terms of the size of the project. We were talking an extremely large contract worth millions of dollars.

I'm of the opinion that the reason there were no contractors involved in that particular project was not because of them wanting an ability, but being denied the opportunity.

Certainly as the local president of the NAACP it would be our desire and intent to begin monitoring more closely many of the various processes. The State of Alaska has suggested that they are suffering from a reduction in staff and if indeed the lack of staff presents a problem in terms of them monitoring effectively the compliance with those monies then perhaps there should be a moratorium on the monies until there is a corresponding staff support in place.

I only suggest that because I realize how important the State as well as local economies are at this point in terms of those Federal monies. Yet beyond that of the general contractors and those select few who may actually land the contracts are those which ultimately work on those job sites.

It's my hope and desire that from the testimony

3

4

5

6 7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

21

2324

25

you've received here today that you will be able to see through the rhetoric and actually see the actual need.

Enforcement has been less than aggressive.

Compliance has been without a doubt less than acceptable. The -if you will, the monitoring at times comes after the fact, after
the jobs are already -- you know, everyone's packed up, headed
back home, there's no additional money to be attained and to
simply find out afterwards that, yeah, they were in violation,
but there's nothing we can do now, it seems that I believe there
is much which can occur.

Again referring to the State programs wherein there are 10 major projects which are monitored I believe that there is far enough advance notification of those projects wherein the bid process should occur in such a fashion to where prior to the actual prime being landed that compliance — one should be able to know up front whether or not compliance is being met as opposed to wondering after the fact.

The climatic considerations was another point alluded to and I do't know, again, I found it rather difficult to actually sit through and wonder really the real intent and purpose behind some of the testimony being offered.

The percentage of prospective contractors who lack program familiarity I think is very low. I don't think it's high too suggest that that's why there is a low amount of participation.

Additionally, I believe there are significant

1

4

5

6

7

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

22 23

21

2425

percentages of certified contractos which simply again are not being extended, if you will, equal access, or opportunity.

In closing I would hope that from this hearing you will be able to not only apply measures within the State, but as you suggested on a regional basis develope some type of continunity wherein there is a functional model as opposed to a model representative of however many states there may be within the region.

I can assure you that we will take a more aggressive approach to the monitoring and perhaps even establish more effective communication and contact with the various organizations which are tasked with not only approving and setting percentage compliance factors, but to be involved with them as much as the system will allow our participation to be involved with them in setting those goals. And I hope that some good can come from what you guys are doing here today.

That concludes my comments.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: Yes.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: I appreciate your comments,
Mr. Barlow, and I would hope that you—both with the State and
with Mr. Casey, that you would follow though and see if there is
some kind of an on going way that you can assure yourself that
things are working, or not working. In other words, that you get
those statistics, 'cause I think that consistency in hammering at

the system if often the only way that things get done. I know I as an elected official certainly -- if I keep getting phone calls I'll get around to it.

But one of the things that I think might be useful we're always doing, all of us, buck passing and I don't want to do that with you in this regard. We as an advisory committee to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights have a fairly limited and well defined ability to either act, or not act and I'd like to turn -- Mr. Dulles, I'm going to ask a question of you.

Mr. Dulles, what exactly can we do as a result of this hearing? We have listened. It has been of great interest to us. We have learned some things in terms of inconsistencies in the Federal program, some difficulties that Mr. Casey and others are facing with their program, some suggestions from them in terms of increased education, getting into the system, they're own bureaucratic system, some suggested changes that are going to be forthcoming in the State. So here we are, we've learned that and that's fine, but what can we do about it?

Can we, for example, at the end of this meeting say that we wish this compiled as a report of a public hearing and send it forth to the Commission? Can we ask that it be made available to a number of Federal agencies? That copies can be made available obviously to all of the people that came and took time? What is the most effective thing that we can do and what are we limited to do?

MR. DULLES: We had a brief discussion, Senator, on this this morning in terms of the process and Mr. Schapira came up with what I thought was an excellant suggestion. We are obtaining a full transcript of these proceedings. That transcript should be available within two, to three weeks. We are going to send individual copies of the transcript to the Advisory Committee members, then ask you within a reasonable period of time to provide staff in our regional office with what you feel to be the most important issues, or information coming out of this little hearing.

Based on that we will put together a report in your behalf, on behalf of the Alaska Advisory Committee. It will be your report and it will be submitted to the National Commission, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

In that document you may wish to make specific findings and recommendations. You may ask the Commission on Civil Rights to communicate with other departments of the Federal Government, with the President, with the Congress, it will be up to them whether the yfollow through, but you are not limited in terms of advice and recommendations to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.

But in a strictly legal sense this Advisory

Committee is limited to advising the United States Commission on

Civil Rights.

Now as a by product of that, of course, the

transcript will be available to other interested parties and we will do everything that we can to assist in making the information available to the community at large, but just in a narrow sense, why, this Committee is limited to advising the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, but you are not limited in terms of what that advise might be. And so there will be a report generated from this meeting and eventually once it is gotten into the hands of the Commissioners it will be made public as well.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: Yes.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: I just -- you know, Mr. Barlow, I wanted -- I knew that would be the answer because we have many times wanted to react in pretty forceful ways and as you perhaps know a little bit of the history of the -- what's happened to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights in terms of funding and continunity and ability to do reports, but I would hope -- I was unfortunately not able to be here this morning that following Mr. Schapira's suggestions that we to the maximum disseminate this information, or request that it do, but I didn't want you to go away feeling, well, now I've told that group and everything is going to be okay, 'cause we'll do what we can.

MR. BARLOW: Um-hum. Okay. Thank you. May I ask a question of Mr. Alex then?

MR. ALEX: Sure.

MR. BARLOW: Since you're the Chairman of the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Alaska contingent, will you, or is it your intent to make copies of the findings? Will you provide copies to various effected groups, or concerned parties?

MR. ALEX: Can I say that I think that that was the answer to the question. Once we made it available to the Commission, you know, that's a matter of public document and can be distributed to the participants and interested parties.

One thing I do want to just add to the process of law and understanding of law. Back a number of years ago I was involved with the -- first involved with the implementation of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. Back then I was a little naive about government and law and assumed that once a law was passed that the government would enforce it.

One of the first things I realized shortly thereafter in 1973 was that the United States Government was the worse one for implementing a law passed by the Congress. And that what was diligence on my part and the parts of other people with similar interests what we did is we -- we made the government comply with the law.

I know that some times they pass laws without any funding and that all it is is window dressing and unless somebody is, you know, diligently monitoring -- and that's why I'm bringing it up, the monitoring is part of the process of getting the laws implemented.

One of the things that is possible with monitoring

is to expose the actual discrimination. In the case of actual discrimination, repeated discrimination and then something can be done about it. We can report it to the Commission, the Commission can report it to the respective federal agency responsible for enforcement, but the part — a very important part of that process though is monitoring. And deligence in pursuing, you know, the implementations of the laws that exist to protect Civil Rights.

I did have

MR. SCHAPIRA: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: Yes, Mitch.

MR. SCHAPIRA: I'd like to ask Mr. Barlow a few questions if I may. You've heard previous speakers talk about problems in discriminatory practices in the bonding industry. In your capacity as the local chairman of the NAACP do you care to comment on whether or not this is a problem that you're aware of in our community?

MR. BARLOW: It is a problem. I don't know if it is in terms of looking at a number of other problems if that is the number one problem. Certainly there are individuals which have difficulty in obtaining bond without a doubt there.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Well, is that because of discriminatory practices, or is it because of a past history that has excluded them from the industry and therefore they don't have the capital, or they don't have the technical background?

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. BARLOW: I would say it's a combination of the first two factors you alluded to and with emphasis I don't believe the last statement made relative to a lack of ability comes into play.

Mr. Casey, I think, said quite well the fact that there are, if you will, umbrella type of situations which occur. Similar opportunities are not extended to MBE's, WBE's though they exist for others. That perhaps is nothing which can be monitored, or, if you will, controlled by an agency. And as you have already stated I believe that there is probably historical place as well.

Discrimination again, that is something which in terms of case law one would have to look at and with a specific focus in mind. I suspect that in certain instances that probably does occur.

MR. SCHAPIRA: In the realm of those discriminatory practices some times people discriminate by accepting stereotypical views of people and making judgements that are well intentioned, but influenced by stereotypes and prejudice as compared to other individuals who, you know, believe in the separation of the races, or -- and so forth.

Now you indicated before that there was some of that stereotyping going on in that you gave an example of, I guess, a prime contractor stating that it seems that minority businesses were afraid of the big projects, or something like that.

Regarding the latter type -- the other type of prejudice, not the buying of stereotypes, but rather the intentional separation and exclusion, are you aware of instances of that type of prejudice in the insurance industry and bonding industry?

MR. BARLOW: Certainly issues such as that have been brought to our attention and legally there have been cases which have been presented and are being pursued relative to that. And it's unfortunate that there are instances wherein just based on race, or sex a person, or firm may be eliminated from further consideration.

I think we're mature enough to acknowlege that that does exists, not that that makes it acceptable, but that it does exists and it must be properly addressed.

MR. SCHAPIRA: A final question for you,
Mr. Barlow, is this, the speakers who preceded you talked about
the difficulties which arise from the fact that there are no
standard procedures for the certification of minority owned
businesses, or businesses owned by women, et cetera. Do you have
any suggestion for how your organization can participate in
establishing standarized procedures for the certification of
minority owned businesses?

MR. BARLOW: Well, certainly I believe participation could occur not only from our organization, but many others which share an equal concern. That participation

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

could very well manifest itself in the form of public hearings, forums, wherein the issues are raised, the constructs are presented and from there recommendations are developed. I don't believe it's a foreign process. I'm convinced that there is a need for some type of mechanism and I would not attempt to identify that without actually deliberating on it. There are processes probably available wherein a community agency can work together and develop a viable program certification.

MR. SCHAPIRA: As the chairman of the local chapter of the NAACP can I have your assurances that your organization is willing to work with local and State organizations to develop standarized and consistent processes for certifying minority owned businesses?

MR. BARLOW: Without a doubt. We have a standing labor and industry subcommittee which has not been as active as it needs to be, but soon will become much more active and certainly that assurance is there and that involvement will follow.

MR. SCHAPIRA: And I -- can I assume that the national association also has a labor and practices committee that would have expertise that could be brought to bear on this problem?

MR. BARLOW: Exactly, your assumption is correct.

Our local model is an adaption of the national, um-hum.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Thank you.

24

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1 MR. ALEX: Okay. I have one question just 2 generically, are you familiar with any activities that -- with 3 regards to discrimination that might be of interest to this 4 Advisory Commission? 5 MR. BARLOW: Well, I think we have -- those 6 activities have already been addressed in terms of the major 7 issue of the contracts. Beyond that and without deleving into 8 specifics the general category, of course, would be maligning of 9 contracts and that has been the reoccurring concern and again 10 not just from an MBE, but I believe from WBE as well. And again, 11 the concerns are from those which are qualified, competent and 12 willing to participate yet for whatever reason -- and I think we 13 could probably begin to identify those reason relatively easy. 14 MR. ALEX: Okay. Thank you. 15 MR. BARLOW: Okay. Um-hum. 16 MR. ALEX: I see we have Earlene here from the 17 Alaska Association of Subcontractors. Do you want to come 18 forward? 19 MS. CARESS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I didn't 20 attend earlier and I left my notes, because being a small business 21

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET, SUITE 101 509 W. 3RD AVENUE 1007 W. 3RD AVENUE
277-0572-277-0573 277-8543 272-7515

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

from the Associated Subcontractors of Alaska. And do you want me

to go into some of the background that we went into before? Go

person they're at my office and I ended up in the car.

State you name.

I'm Earlene Caress and I'm

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:

MS. CARESS: Okay.

22

23

24

25

through the whole

2

3

4 5

6

7

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ALEX: Yes.

MS. CARESS: ASA was formed about a year ago for the promotion and education and understanding of contractual procedures on the subcontractor level.

Now a subcontractor is a second tiered from a principal owner and what we did is we decided that there were some concerns that we as a group needed to address.

General contractors had their organization to where they could address directly the owners. Suppliers had their own organization. They're below us and they could address the situation, so we decided that maybe perhaps being in the middle between all of this that we would get together and find out what we need to do too.

Basically it's a group of people from about every type of subcontracting you can come into contact with. It is mechanical, electrical, fabrication. It's considered some small general contractors who do specific -- what you would refer to as a general. He may do a lot of different fields within that, but he's just not a very large individual. You have people who have one truck, one employee, themselves, all the way up to an employer that we have, 35, so it's kind of a large range and group of individuals.

Within this group there is all women owned, all types of ownership at that level. We have the Native contractors

as an associate member. We have many -- probably you'll see us in a lot of these different groups. This group, however, I represent as a subcontractor not as a WBE, so that kind of -- I'm on the other side of the fence on this.

Basically I'll repeat a little bit what I talked about before that the association feels very strongly that whatever program is put into being if it's handled correctly in a clear, concise manner it helps everybody. It's not a feeling that by any type of preferential treatment on a subcontractor because he does have a minority backing that would harm him. There is absolutely none of that.

What we do feel very strongly about is no matter what program you people have, or whatever it is if it's handled correctly and enforced it's good for all of us.

The one reason why we do stand behind -- and this is a selfcentered attitude, is is that through a situation like today, I'm here talking to you because you're listening. I can come here as a subcontractor and I finally have a way out. By telling you our problems as subcontractors it's even greater in the minority or WBE sector. So it's kind of handy to be able to tell you from our side what's going on.

Do you want me to go into anymore about the subcontractor's association as such? Do you care for more?

MR. SCHAPIRA: I think I'm interested in you addressing

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Your problems. 1 MR. SCHAPIRA: the problems. 2 3 MS. CARESS: Okay. Basically in dealing with any 4 of the programs from a government situation on the subcontractor 5 level, first of all I'd like to explain what a subcontractor is 6 and who he does and what he is all about. 7 Five years ago when you talked about a general 8 contractor you were talking about a gentleman who in your own 9 mind's eye you would think would be a very large employer, very --10 more affluent. I mean, he was the one that had some money backing 11 him. 12 In this time and over the last five years it has 13 gotten to where a general contractor may be one individual. 14 basically has gone down to a project manager. The 98 percent of 15 all their work now is subcontracted out to subcontractors. The 16 reason for this 17 MR. SCHAPIRA: Is that an accurate percentage, or 18 is that 19 MS. CARESS: Yes, it's 20 MR. SCHAPIRA: a figure of speech? 21 98 percent of -- if you look MS. CARESS: 22 at the base employment on going through the reports, the 23 certified payroll on a government, find out what is the difference 24 between what a general is submitting under his own payroll and 25 what he submits for his subs. It's over 98 percent. So you can

see that a great deal of work is spread out among what we refer to as a subcontractor.

A subcontractor is sitting what they call in a second tiered level from a general. In other words, some times a general contractor can meet his goals by the use of subcontractors and as -- as a portion of his goals. He's going to have to if he's not -- if he's not employing anybody he's going to have to use then the subcontract.

Some of the problems that we have seen as sub- -- subcontractors dealing with some of the programs where you're trying to obtain goals is, number 1, when a goal is set by an owner and saying that they want three percent WBE, 25 percent NBE, or whatever and they say there isn't enough bids, or there aren't enough reactions out of the community in these areas to qualify on the bidding. I think the problem right there gets to be nobody ever asked us why.

Sitting in the situation we're sitting into (sic) we have to be in a very arbitrating situation. We only obtain our jobs from general contractors, period. They are our bread and butter. However, we are their bank. In other words, we front all of your projects. You all pay the owner and we still wait to get payment which I'm sure you've heard this all the way through there.

But getting in -- I'm trying to hit areas that I know other people haven't talked about. But on the subcontractor

13 -

level a lot of subcontractors no longer can afford the privilege of subcontracting with some of the generals who get the jobs.

In other words, if a contractor is not going to pay its sub in a prompt manner can you affort to do the job. My accounts receivable on the whole, 120 day aged, normal. It's very difficult to explain this to your banker when you're telling him that you need a working capital loan and he says, well, if you'd only sit on your accounts you'd probably be better off. But that's not the way real life is.

Even when a general says, which they always say, we will pay you when you (sic) get paid. I'm a steel fabricator and that means I buy my materials, pay my men up to a certain period of time. I bill them. I wait till their next billing cycle. They bill whoever they do and then they retain the money. The funny part about that is I will pay you when I get paid. How do we know when they get paid?

If you don't know, or if they have a reputation in the sublevel as not being prompt at all you may not bid with them. And I think that I have found more people this year on the sublevel that has finally said, even though you are my bread and butter I can't afford it. I just -- I'd rather -- you know, you can only do so much for cost and then after a while you've got to do something else.

So basically on these programs, does anybody ever come back when a goal isn't reached. Does anybody go back and do

1

4

3

6

5

8

7

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

2122

2324

25

a survey of the subs in some way that they can re- -- you know, say what they mean without getting in trouble with anybody and say I can't bid with him because I don't get paid.

Or two, when you let a bid and you say, yeah, you get a bid for \$100,000.00 by the time you get paid does anybody find out it may be only \$70,000.00. Why? Well, we have change orders, we have deletions to contracts. We have all sorts of things that it's really a very normal course of business, but sometimes it's not quite normal.

You can get bid and end up going all the way through until you think -- and then all of a sudden you find out, no, we're sorry, we're not going to use you on this portion.

The third problem is, I'm a steel erection and fabrication. I cannot handle a job of \$750,000.00 worth of project. I can't front it, so when they get it out and they say, gee, nobody came forward to bid on this project.

Unfortunately in the State of Alaska a subcontractor even though it is the largest employment base in the construction industry it is the most long term and it basically has the most economic benefit back to a community, we can't do anything because we sit in the second position as far as loans, banking, anything is concerned.

An owner can sell a -- I mean, a contractor can sell a project to a bank because they are directly dealing with an owner. You step off of that ownership and a bank says no. So

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

2021

2223

24

25

by our own economic problem up here, you've got the problem you can't front a job on a sublevel. You can't grow. You can't do any thing at that point. It's a very slow process to get -- to move ahead on a subcontracting level.

But I think if -- if when you're talking about goals that you come back and after you've established all of this you find out why and where are the people that you supposedly have ready to be able to bid on these projects and I think that right in itself would answer a lot of your problems when people talk about a program not working. It may be working fine, but you may be missing the other side of it that perhaps there is some problem why we can't bid and -- and do the job.

Is there any other questions, or that? I can get into the manufacturing and all the things that we did before, so it's whatever.

MR. ALEX: Do you have questions?

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: Arliss.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: You know, just to make an observation. I think that information is very useful. It has not been presented and wasn't something I thought about. We -- we talk about people getting in, getting qualified, problems of compliance, lack of staff, but not in a sense going back. The kind of thing that's the toughest for us to do and it's really a performance evaluation. You've got to -- you've got a program,

but does that program work really and that step is -- is -- well, I remember when I chaired legislative budget and audit, we did performance evaluations that unfortunately have not been carried on in terms of the permanent fund and in terms of Alaska housing, in terms of AIDA, to see whether they meet their overall legislative goals. And I don't think we're doing that kind of evaluation to say if that program really is working.

MS. CARESS: I think that's been the

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Yeah.

MS. CARESS: You know, when you talk about what DOT requirements are, that's set by somebody. The judgement of whether you feel a person is qualified is only done by qualified people and an enforcement of those rules. Those are very simple. But I think your evaluation, some of the things that come from the other side when I see the goals weren't met and I talk to people say, well, you know, it's not that side of it. The side that you're not hearing is is why aren't we bidding on them. Not to assume that it isn't working at that point. There are some of us who have managed to get through all of the qualifications and whatever else that we need to do, but we can't -- we're still caught.

MR. ALEX: Mitch.

MR. SCHAPIRA: In your association of subcontractors what percentage of sub -- of companies are minority, or women owned?

24

25

MS. CARESS: We have approximately 35 and -- and that kind of a

> MR. SCHAPIRA: Is that a percent?

MS. CARESS: Yeah. And it's kind of a loose one because a lot of the times within -- if you have a corporation and the owner happens to be a minority we would not know that, but if they did stiuplate on their application that they were we noted it, but other than that -- so there are a lot more out there than that.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Do you have any suggestions for what steps could be taken to standarized the definitions, or qualifications for minority owned business and women owned business?

MS. CARESS: You mean just a straight, what I would considering a qualifying?

MR. SCHAPIRA: Well, a pervious speakers have identified a problem in that the DOT may have one standard, the FAA may have another, the BIA yet a third, et cetera and it appears to me from todays forum that the problem is -- that one problem is standarizing these procedures. If you were going to make a recommendation to the United States Civil Rights Commission and know that the Secretary of Transportation and Labor were going to listen to you as we all do know that, what recommendation would you make about standardizing that?

MS. CARESS: I can't make a comment other than the

comment that if DOT sets a standard and the State of Alaska chooses to work under the DOT, then that is the standard we'll go by.

The problem that you run into is being in -- in reality living in the State of Alaska is what you said, that if we're going to go by DOT standards we should go for them for everything, or we should have two separate types. We shouldn't have the Municipality and the State and the State DOT any different. If we're going to go standard, let's take what the Federal has for your DOT projects and either decide that that is what the State itself should go for, or the State should have its own set of recommendations. Any my recommendations would be a lot different than DOTs, that's for sure.

MR. SCHAPIRA: And how so? And how so?

MS. CARESS: One of the problems you get into and I can see why they did it, was the actual -- in my type of work, okay. Mind you, I have a welding/fabrication/erection business, I also have a degree in accounting and computer science so that puts me on, you know, the one side. I am also a certified welder which doesn't mean anything because there are 621 positions and I'm only certified in 210 for whatever good that does us all, but one of the problems is that they do require me the actual field supervision and actuality to do the work.

Now field supervision to a certain extent is true, but I have a job going in Juneau, one in Fairbanks and one here,

I can't be in all three places at the same time. I hopefully have employed two individuals to do that, but they don't like They like that you be on that job and in the supervision field.

The other problem that you get into is if you decide to increase -- let's say I want to increase my certification by getting into an area that is closely related. In other words, I'm going to have to diversify to exist. going to have to and I -- you know, the State of Alaska is realizing that too, if I care to divert where is my expertise going to come from. Do I go out and hire it? Do I buy it? buy it it's not DOT. I have to be able to do it myself.

Now in the corporation I have right now I have 23 employees. In that 23 employees there are people that do make decisions. Yes, they have a limit, but they do make decisions. I can't do it all. So if you're going to go DOT you're always -you're restricting that individual from growing. You're hampering him from being able to rely on expertise.

Of course, you can get a lot of abuses. by saying, hey, I'll front you, you go it. I don't know how to solve that one, but I do know you are restricting the growth.

There are some people that I have talked to that like I said in this -- everybody talks about the economy. really has been no different for a subcontractor. The State is just finally waking up to what -- something we realized for a long

1

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

time what's been going on, but you have to diversify. You're always trying to more into an area that you feel isn't covered and I'll guarantee you there's no way I can diverse anymore right now without having to hire that personnel in. So you're going to restrict us -- a minority enterprise to a DOT standard in size and growth potential. By restricting him you will always keep in 6 under the contract level of about 25,000. So if you're asking for a subcontractor to grow, or a contractor to do this and 8 develop their expedtise and develop a corporation and have a 10 growth potential and a profit pre- -- you can't do it. 11 You've told him you cannot do it. You will

1

2

3

4

5

7

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

always stay in this ball game. Then you get right round robin. What -- one of your contracts break down to 20, or 25,000. it's -- you know, it's -- I -- it's a selflimiting program all the way around.

For me to stay -- to do the jobs I can do with required DOT absolute by the letter of the law I could do no more than about 250,000 a year gross. That would be my max. can't live off of 250,000. So you've hampered his growth, you've offered him something, you've offered it in too big of a chunk. He's not big enough to take it.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Would one solution be to some how recognize the utilization of outside experts who are minorities and women as part of the compliance with the requirement of -- or in lieu of minority ownership, or

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

MS. CARESS: Again, now you're getting into the point of a judgement. You're making a judgement on my business. Maybe that expertise isn't available, you know, that -- that's the whole problem. If you -- you know, if you're going to cut the program and get it so it holds those main regulations, you're, you know -- by hiring an expertise if -- I would have to go to try to find an expertise in that field would be very difficult. I don't get many women welders in the door.

MR. ALEX: Gil.

MR. GUITIERREZ: You mentioned one time, or the last meeting kind of briefly that you had done some research regarding contracting over a period of time. Could we have a copy of that and (indiscernible - interrupted)

MS. CARESS: I'm sorry, I didn't bring it, but
I'd be happy -- anybody -- what I did is I took a -- being if -being a manufacturer in the State of Alaska I decided I wasn't
making it and I think the first thing you have to do is you have
to go in house and find out what you're doing. When I went in
house and I found out, you know, my billable hours were higher
than national average, everything was higher. Why, you know,
what's going wrong. I decided to find out where my competition
was and where -- and what -- what good it was deriving. How they
were making it when I wasn't.

My major competition comes from outside the State. This competition that comes from outside the State is

5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

17

16

19 20

18

21

23

22

2425

able through its direct cost associated with it doing business are a great deal different than mine both in insurance, workmen's comp especially, unemployment, for my direct expenses, utilities, property tax and interstate transportation brings my cost of doing a job 47 percent higher than what it costs an individual to do this in Washington State, or Oregon State.

When I did a study of all of this I wanted to find out if it was all construction people were idots, bad managers. There is 100 percent turn on Alaskan based general contractors over an 18 month period.

What I mean by that Alaskan, is I hung the title of owner being residing in the State of Alaska. That was just the priority. I didn't mean his agent for six months and I didn't mean his Box office. I said the owners resided.

When I did this I found over an 18 month period that a contractor might break into the market at about 50,000. He increases until he hits about 250,000. Then all of a sudden he's no longer. When you have a turn of 100 percent on anything no one is that bad. Ninty-eight percent -- national average is 94 percent of all construction businesses will fail, but not 100 percent in 18 months. So that's what created the need for me to find out.

You know, I don't like to be classified as a bad business person. I really try very hard at this and when I found out that just in my own area 47 percent higher costs. And now

1

4 5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14,

15 16

17

18

19 20

2122

23

2425

I'm faced besides 47 percent cost, I've got another additional cost coming up of workmen's comp that's going to be increasing. The City says they will increase my property taxes. I know that the Municipal Light and Power has a 20 percent increase. I'm a heavy utility users.

I have decided now this is the last thing as far as all of us manufacturers -- I am the only one left. HCI Steel Products had a beautiful -- two factory buildings, one in Wasilla, one in Anchorage area, they shut down and moved to Kent, Washington. Alaska Steel's fabrication shop is located in Washington. Where are all of your millwork truss. Alaska Truss and Mill, all the millwork manufacturing plants, your United Lumber, SBS, Budget and that, where are they? They're gone.

Look at the trouble Mat-Su Maid is in. Everybody tells you it's got to be cheaper to send milk from Mat-Su to Anchorage than it is a bottle of milk up from Seattle and I can prove that it costs me more to ship from Anchorage -- well, it's actually 3.5 times more to ship from Anchorage to Barrow than it does out of Seattle. I can ship cheaper out of Seattle to Homer than Sea- -- or they can ship cheaper than I can to Homer, Seattle can. Because we have no interstate transportation.

If I want to make something here to send to southeast I have to ship it to Seattle and have Seattle ship it to Juneau. And they double duty me on the way out too. So these types of costs that are built in to me as a con- -- you

1 2·

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

know, where I'm trying to get a dollar off of a competitive bid.

Why do they use me? Why am I still in business?

Because Number 1 thank God plans aren't perfect and they've got alterations. Because I am what they call the cleanup person. But this is the base of employment when you're talking about the construction industry. It's not the general contractor who does the employing. It's us subs. It's us subs who the banks don't like because we don't have a contract with the owner. So that was kind of the gist of the study. It -- it's kind of comprehensive, but it's all based in statistical evidence, 'cause I have to find out why.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: General contractors is shifting all the costs, isn't he, workmen's comp

MS. CARESS: What he did -- right.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Um-hum.

MS. CARESS: What they do now is -- five years ago a general contractor basically had a large core group of individuals that worked on an on going basis for him and this became kind of hard for him because he would have to front the project. Now you can go out and get subs. They front your project literally. We all front it and we're looking at -- especially on a manufacturing like I am now I'm looking at 100, probably 190 days. Now that is not full payment.

Now comes the good part, you get the one to two percent retainage until the project is approved. That could be a

2 robin problem. 3 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Sure, no good accounts 4 receivable after that all happens. 5 MS. CARESS: Most people think that anything in 6 that column isn't worth a whole lot. You can talk about your 7 protections back against the general back against the owner if 8 you have enough money and enough -- if you can hold out long 9 enough you'll make it, but I'm sure there are people sitting in 10 this room right now that if you don't have a contract that hasn't 11 been paid for that's from a Federal government and you're a 12 contractor and you hadn't done any Federal work, so 13 MR. ALEX: Further questions? 14 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Good testimony. 15 MR. GUITIERREZ: No, I just need a copy of that. 16 MS. CARESS: I'll be happy to. If you'll give me 17 your card or something and I'll be happy to get you something. 18 MR. GUITIERREZ: Send it to John. 19 MS. CARESS: Okay. 20 MR. GUITIERREZ: Thank you. 21 MS. CARESS: Thank you. 22 Thank you. Now we're going to go into MR. ALEX: 23 an open session. We're a little bit late, but then Earlene 24 started a little bit late and then we had Don Barlow come ahead 25 as part of the open session, so we're not into open session.

year away. And then that's -- you know, it's -- it's a round

1

understand that we have Janet Bradley here and Francis Gallela. They both want to address the Commission and Willie Overstreet. Since we have -- since I had -- unless -- yes (indiscernible conversation away from microphone)

Yeah, this is an open session now and I think we can start off with Janet. Could you state your name for the

MS. BRADLEY: Yes, for the record my name is

Janet Bradley. I'm the executive director of the Alaska State

Commission for Human Rights and with me here today I'm pleased

to introduce -- although she needs no introduction to many of you,

our newly appointed Commissioner Katie Hurley of Wasilla.

Thank you very much, Chairman Alex, and members of the Commission and Mr. Dulles. Thank you very much for inviting me here today. I won't take your time with repeating some of the problems that you've already heard here today. I would like especially to tell you how much I have learned from listening to some of the testimony that's been offered here.

But I would like to at least state so that all of us understand that the State Human Rights Commission has no responsibility in the area of contract compliance. I know all of you know that, but sometimes many people who are involved even on the Civil Rights Commissions do not understand the delineation of responsibility within State government.

However, the concern for MBE, FBE and affirmative action among state contractors and subcontractors has been very

much at the Commission's core of concern since 1978. And in fact, we entered into litigation in 1982 as a result of the failure of compliance with a predetermination settlement, which was concluded between the State Human Rights Commission and the State Department of Transportation and Public Facilities. That litigation was settled out of court. And that settlement agreement is no longer in effect. That is to say the course of compliance with that out of court settlement has now expired.

Nevertheless, the State Human Rights Commission remains concerned about the problems that you've heard hear today because we also hear them. We hear them through complaints which are filed in our office under a section of our statute which prohibits unlawful practices of discrimination by the state or its political subdivision.

With respect to bonding, I know that is one of the issues we've heard mentioned today, it would be jurisdictional, a jurisdictional cause of action for a minority or a female or a member of the protected class to allege that they were denied bonding by financial institutions. To the best of my knowledge we do not see those types of complaints; therefore, I would conclude that the bonding problems are less associated with discrimination, and more associated with the kinds of problems that the previous speaker just identified.

With respect to where the Commission is at this point in its concern I would like to quote from our annual report

1 wh
2 th
3 cc
4 wh
5 cc
6 re
7 en
8 ar
9 ar
10 cc
11 re
12 in
13 pr
14 ar

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which I think says pretty well what the commissioners feel about this problem in state government. And we're going to limit our concerns to what happens in state government because that is where the focus of our action has been. Commissioner -- then Commissioner then Chair Person Virgie King wrote in our annual report "The Commission believes that minority/female business enterprise and affirmative requirements for state contractors are major items of unfinished business in our state. are mindful of the budget deficit and the need for cost (ph) containment in state government these matters demand attention to resolve the Commission's lingering concerngs for equal opportunity in affirmative action in state government. The Commission has proposed the formation of a task force to study those concerns and the assignment of civil rights responsibilities within state government."

Now, this report was submitted to the Legislature shortly after the turn of the year in early 1987. Subsequent to that time as you heard described, Ray Price, special assistant to the Governor has gone forward and has solicited comments and has put together a plan. Mr. Price in June met with our commissioners in Fairbanks and described that plan. And we have been continuing to work with him on the implementation.

Overall, if I can summarize the Commission's concerns, we believe that a state office of contract compliance is required. And we believe that that state office of contract

Therefore, I

compliance should be an oversight office. That is, separate and 1 apart from the contracting agency. That is the subsistence of 2 the Commission's position. And we are still eager to see 3 We are very concerned because we hear the same that happen. problems that you've heard here today. And I know this is a 5 difficult time in state government. I know everyone is strapped, 6 but we feel that there still can be some progress. 7 would urge you to the extent that it is possible to focus attention on the state level. I don't know how successful you might be at the federal level because of the many opportunities 10 for the bureaucracy to intervene, but certainly at the state level 11 you hav the capability of using your authority and using your 12 status as the Advisory Commission to get behind efforts to 13 effect the creation of that office here in Alaska. 14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Human Rights Commission would be very interested in working with you and working with the community to see that happen. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you might have. And then, I'm sure that Commissioner Hurley would like to add her comments.

MR. GUITIERREZ: I have a question.

MR. ALEX: Go ahead.

MR. GUITIERREZ: I'm interested in the idea of a contract compliance program. Given the Statute 1880 and the idea that your agency can do studies or even do some, you know, bigger studies, what do they call that, more than

> R & R COURT REPORTERS 810 N STREET, SUITE 101 509 W. 3RD AVENUE 1007 W. 3RD AVENUE 277-0572 - 277-0573 277-8543 272-7515 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

individual studies of discrimination, class actions

MS. BRADLEY: You're talking about directors (indiscernible) class action complaints.

MR. GUITIERREZ: Right. Directors charges.
Wouldn't that contract compliance office kind of fit under your organization as an enforcement agency?

MS. BRADLEY: That's a really complex question,
Gil, if I may call you that. I know that Ray Price in creating
his plan collected models from all over the country. With respect
to the Human Rights Commission's position we are somewhat
reluctant to see an additional responsibility of that magnitude
given to us. And we have always felt that it was very difficult
for us to get the budget that was required to do those things
that are mandated by law. So, we have not welcomed the idea of
accepting additional responsibility.

Let me also say that the problem has been magnified over the last five years because as a result of the move of the Office of EEO from the Department of Administration into to the office of the Governor we now have three civil rights agencies within the office of the Governor. And those agencies include the Women's Commission, The State Human Rights Commission, and the Office of Equal Opportunity. It is perceived by many, including members of the Legislature, that our duties overlap and that we have duplication of effort. And we are constantly trying to get the information out to the public what it is that

3

5

7

6

8

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

we do, how we complement the work of the Women's Commission, and how the Office of Equal Opportunity is separate and apart and has a different mission from us.

So, to answer your question directly we are not seeking that responsibility. We're seeking the resolution of the problem, we believe that a separate office is necessary.

MR. GUITIERREZ: That, of course, brings about more funding and a different kind of a package program.

MS. BRADLEY: That's true. And of course, whether it's funded through our agency or whether it's funded through the Office of EEO, or a separate office, whatever the final plan looks like, the need is there. And while I think that there can be some economies through merger of programs sometimes merger of programs results in just the opposite, that there's not a clear delineation of authority. It imposes conflict situations. And in fact, what it does instead of creating two programs it destroys two programs.

MR. ALEX: Further questions? Katy.

MS. HURLEY: Thank you. I just wanted to say listening to Senator Sturgulewski I had a lot of empathy for her position because it seems to me that we have heard these same things over and over again. Four years ago when I was with the Women's Commission we met with contractors and with the unions regarding women getting into -- getting contracts and so forth. And I guess I feel that what we need to do is put

the pressure on the administration to make this a priority. That not do we necessarily need to have more funding, but the funds need to be channeled so that this is priority, this is something that is funded. And, with the numbers and numbers of staff that you have in DOT it certainly seems to me that that small amount of money could be found. And it's just a matter of somebody saying this is important and this is where we ought to spend the dollars. And I certainly hope that even though you are an Advisory Committee Commission that you will use your good influence because I do feel that to what for it to happen on the federal level is going to — it's not going to happen to help the people here.

And one more thing before I forget it, I'm sorry that there wasn't more publicity about this meeting because I know that when I was in the Legislature I had a lot of minority businesses calling me to find out, you know, why they couldn't get certified. And I think they would be here with their cases, especially women who are owning 51 percent of a business where they are with their husband, which seems to be a real tough nut to crack. And also having it in the middle of the day always hurts people who are in small businesses who can't take the time to come. And if you could ask for people to send in, you know, instances of feeling of being left out maybe that would help your record and get more because I know that there are a lot of people. But, it's very discouraging, I'm sure, because when I

1 look
2 l0 3 mind
4 of t
5 said
6 last

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

look back over the years, and it's not just four years, it's lik 10 - 15 years of seeing this very -- it's so difficult for minorities and especially for women to be recognized because of the finance. And I really appreciate what the subcontractor said about the attitude of banks and the fact that they are the last people to be paid, and how can you survive.

And we should be able to as especially the legislators, I think, could put the pressure on the administration.

And we'll do -- I'll do what I can to back you up.

MS. BRADLEY: If I could say something on the point of women being denied certification. I have had several persons speak to me privately, not through the process of the Human Rights Commission, but I advised these women of their rights under our statute to file complaints about the denial of certification. But, there does seem to be a problem there

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: File complaints with who?

MS. BRADLEY: With us. If an individual is denied certification they have the right to come and say, I believe this was the result of discrimination, that the standards that were applied to me were unfair, had an adverse impact on me as a women, as a Native, et cetera, et cetera, as a Black, and that I've been denied certification unfairly. We would accept such a complaint.

Three such individuals have spoken to me at meetings just like this where I've been attending, have taken

202122232425

1

4

5

7

8

10

11 12

13

15

14

16 17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

me aside and described their problems, and I've advised these individuals of their rights. What it sounds like based on what I've also heard here today is that either the standards are being more strictly applied to some individuals, or there's been a change because many of the female business enterprises who had certification have lost certification. And I don't know what the change has been.

The other thing that I find quite interesting is when I hear the state officials from DOT discuss how they need procedures I am wondering what amount of discretion they have in determining how to apply the standards, which, I believe, are federal regulations. So, I don't know, that leads me to wonder whether -- I'll just leave -- I'll just stop at that, it leaves me to wonder.

MR. SCHAPIRA: These individuals who you advised to file complaints did they, in fact, file complaints?

MS. BRADLEY: Not to the best of my knowledge to date. This was in the month of August. I attended several small business meetings. And I try to go to those meetings to stay in touch with this very question. And I did pick up three individuals, one as an Alaska Native, one was a Black women, and one was a white woman. So, I don't know whether it's race and sex or just sex.

MR. ALEX: Did you have a question?

MR. GUITIERREZ: No, I just had a comment. In

backing up now, we're talking about a compliance agency at the state level when I've always assumed that the feds were going to be the compliance agency. And in a sense they were neutral because we get into state packages now. We have a lot of powerful general contractors or prime contractors out there that would, you know, just lobby against anything like that it seems to me, but I like the idea of a state compliance agency.

You're right. I think we ought to advertise these a lot more. There was a lady that wanted to be here, but she says, well, I never got a formal invitation, so I wasn't sure what to do about the job or how to leave work. But, basically that's the only comment I wanted to make on that compliance thing.

MR. ALEX: Any further questions?

MR. SCHAPIRA: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: Yes, Mitch.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Well, I have a question for Mr. Dulles. Would it be possible for us to solicit comments along the lines suggested by the Commissioner? And if so, what mechanism could we use? Apparently there are numerous instances of people being confronted with arbitrated (ph) decisions about their certification.

MR. DULLES: I'd have to turn that back really on you. In other words, our staff is limited as it is, and as unfamiliar with the state as we are, we'd have to be to a large

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

extent reliant on this Advisory Committee in terms of what groups or organizations need to be contacted or, you know, where we would go to solicit those kinds of information. We have to be very, very careful, Mitch, because if we solicit individual complaints there is, historically and undeniably, an expectation of some rectifying action, some resolution. So, that's why we have to be extremely careful that those individuals or businesses understand the purposes of what they're being asked to do, if I'm making myself clear, since we do not process individual complaints of discrimination. That is not within the purview of the Civil Rights Commission. And we are limited to referring those complaints to appropriate other federal agencies.

We just have to be very, very careful that any testimony that we elicit that it is understood what the purpose of that is. And that is strictly to add to the record that we've developed today. But, it can be done, but you know, it's going to have to be really

MR. SCHAPIRA: Could it be done through news

MR. DULLES: through the Advisory Committee.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Could the solicitation of that type of information be accomplished through newspaper advertisements or in trade journals? Maybe I should ask the Commissioner.

MS. HURLEY: If I may comment, Mr. Chairman. I feel that you as the Chair could make a statement about this

2425

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET, SUITE 101 509 W. 3RD AVENUE 1007 W. 3RD AVENUE 277-0572 277-8543 272-7515

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

be able to, I mean barring not getting any funding, when do

we think we might be able to have another meeting?

MR. DULLES: I don't know. I guess we could tentatively talk about some time in the spring.

MR. ALEX: I look at it, you know, I don't think that there's going to be any huge resolution to the problems that we've been addressing. And it would appear appropriate that when we have our next meeting that there be a continuation of this, and that I think, certainly, there's enough people around that understand that this is a subject that we've been discussing. We're looking for, you know, actual -- you know, looking for, you know, the actual discrimination in the process. We're looking for solutions. And so, what we might do is tentatively state, you know, for the people in attendance that we're planning some time in the spring. And that this still is an active issue.

MR. DULLES: Generally what we do in a meeting like this is we keep the record open for, at least, two or three weeks. If there's some way that the Advisory Committee to assist us and that is back in Los Angeles, in contacting, maybe the Commission can help us, contacting key organizations or business groups or Civil Rights organizations, and soliciting additional testimony to be put in writing and to be mailed in our office. Then, that could be made a part of the record and they could be exhibits. And that could be included as a part of this program.

But, what I'm saying is we would need -- clearly

would need assistance within the state of Alaska because we 1 2 really won't be in a position to do that or even know who should be contacted. I mean that's part of the problem that's being, you 3 4 know, the resources that are available at the regional level for these kinds of efforts. And we can work towards that. 5 have other witnesses. 6 7 MR. ALEX: I was just thinking, the Human Rights Commission has probably a list of people that might want 8 9 MR. DULLES: That's the first thing I did when I called Ms. Bradley's office yesterday 10 11 MS. BRADLEY: Right. 12 MR. DULLES: was to ask if we could get a list of Civil Rights organizations in the state of Alaska, so 13 that next time we'll at least be able to, for sure, contact 14 15 each and every one of those in 16 MS. BRADLEY: Well, I think we need 17 MR. DULLES: anything that we might do. 18 MS. BRADLEY: to be more specific than Civil 19 Rights organizations, but I'll be happy to work with you. 20 personally, will contact those individuals that spoke to me and see if they are willing to come forward with their testimony. 21 22 However, remember that these individuals may not wish to go public with their names because of the fear or retaliation. 23 24 MR. DULLES: And we cannot protect those

individuals.

25

MS. BRADLEY: I want to thank you very much. I know there are other people

MR. ALEX: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BRADLEY: Thank you.

MR. ALEX: We had Louie and Winston here since this morning. I mean these two gentlemen were here since this morning, so if we could proceed. Do you mind

MR. OVERSTREET: Good afternoon, gentlemen, Alex.

For the record, my name is Everett Louis Overstreet. I'm here
today as a representative of the Alaska Black Caucus. I serve
on its board of directors, formerly as its president. And
Janet, I don't have that kind of fear.

MS. BRADLEY: (Inaudible)

MR. OVERSTREET: Right. I want to briefly touch on the history, on an audit that was conducted by the Legislature, a comment on the proposed plan, and a comment on the Cowper administration in this regard.

It was our organization in 1978 that brought this problem to the attention of the Human Rights Commission. It was based on the fact that the Public Works acts of 1977, and I know people don't like to use this word, had a quota set aside of 10 percent. That was not a goal or a time table, it was required that all minority/female businesses receive 10 percent of all those Public Works money. That fear was based on the fact that Alaska had not had a signficant program or had in place

any kind of capability of monitoring how those monies were utilized.

As it turned out, our fear was realized. It didn't happen. And subsequently, some of the issues that Ms. Bradley talked about happened. But, also for the record it should be indicated that those goals and time tables that were contained in that settlement agreement were never realized. They didn't even come close.

Now, the Legislature conducted an audit in 1985 or '86, Senator, you can correct me, and they identified that the problems existed in DOT could not just be pointed to as gross incompetence, but there was significant misrepresentation. And no action has been taken place today to correct that. The young lady who was reporting those figures to the federal government purposely misrepresented what the participation of those were. So, you'll have to excuse me there

But, I want to point out a couple of things in terms of how our organization approached the problem. We were never suggesting that unqualified persons or businesses receive anything. Our concern was that we create a climate where opportunity would exist. And within that climate just document what the activities that took place in that climate and submit an accurate report in that regard so we could accurately work on the problems. So, -- but, with the failure of the young lady who worked on that, who was working in that department

for a number years, and I understand she may still be involved, that was never the case, to continually be misrepresenting -- misrepresentations in terms of the actual participation levels.

What they were doing is taking what the contractor, prime contractor, promised to do and reporting that as gospel. There was not any close-out in what the actual bid estimates of those people they say they were going to do business with.

Now, on a proposed plan, I know that, Arliss you want and Frances and Winston want to talk). I -- in a word the plan stinks. And I say that advisedly 'cause Bob Poe and Ray Price are good friends of mine, but there's no way in the world what they're proposing will work. You could -- if, indeed, it should be a situation of physician heal thyself. The Department of Transportation employs thousands of people, yet in the nine or 10 months that the Cowper administration has been in power they have not appointed one Black in that department, period. If they wanted to say they were serious about employment opportunities at their level, which would be a sign of good faith to the contractors that were doing business with the state, then that would happen. Before the record that has not happened, and I don't think this plan will work as proposed.

And I would certainly support Mrs. Bradley's recommendation that contract compliance oversight be separated out of that department and put in a central office that reports

1 directly to the Governor. And that's basically the end of my 2 comments. I will entertain questions. 3 MR. ALEX: Ouestions? 4 MR. DULLES: What is the percentage of Blacks 5 of the staff of the Department? Do you have any 6 MR. OVERSTREET: Zero. The one guy that was 7 there before Cowper took over they asked for his resignation. 8 So, he's no longer there. He left the state. In fact, the Cowper 9 administration has only appointed one Black person, and that was 10 Ray Price. And I don't think that was race specific because Ray was Cowper's campaign manager here in Anchorage. So, it 11 12 doesn't have anything to do with opportunity. Physical 13 pay-off (ph). 14 MR. DULLES: You're talking about at the 15 executive levels 16 MR. OVERSTREET: Yes, I am. 17 MR. DULLES: or senior levels (ph)? 18 MR. OVERSTREET: Right. 19 MR. SCHAPIRA: You support the formation of 20 separate contract compliance office. Where in the state 21 government would you locate it? 22 MR. OVERSTREET: Governor's office. 23 MR. SCHAPIRA: Not withstanding the fact that 24 your statements about the Governor could hardly be interpreted 25 as very favorable.

MR. OVERSTREET: That's true. And I hope they 1 report it back to him. 2 MS. STURGULEWSKI: I'm sure they will. 3 MR. SCHAPIRA: On that you can rest assured. 4 Any further questions or comments? MR. ALEX: 5 MS. STRUGULEWSKI: Mr. Chairman? 6 MR. ALEX: Yes. 7 MS. STURGULEWSKI: To the point and succinct. 8 What more can you say? 9 MR. ALEX: Thank you. 10 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Louie definitely is. Louis, 11 excuse me. Mr. Overstreet, sir. 12 Thank you very much for the MR. OVERSTREET: 13 opportunity. 14 MR. ALEX: We have Francis Gallela, Project 15 Director, Minority Business Development Center. 16 MR. GALLELA: Thank you, Chairman Alex. 17 is Francis Gallela. I'm the director of the Alaska Minority 18 Business Development Center. It's operated by Community 19 Enterprise Development Corporation. And we are funded by the 20 Department of Commerce, Minority Business Development Agency. 21 We've been in existence for approximately five years. 22 there is a problem or type of problem that minority firms have in 23 the state of Alaska we usually hear about it. It usually comes 24 across my desk, and usually dozens of examples come across my

25

desk. And I could talk to you about lots of different problems that minority business persons have, but because we're' limited in time -- and I want to thank Louie for being brief and succinct, I'm just going to mention a few of them. And I'm going to hit a couple that were hit before, but I want to give you a little more indepth explanation of some of the problems and give you

some -- hopefully, give you some solutions.

First of all, the certification problem. The certification problem is not exaggerated. And the people who have testified have not blown it out of proportion. Certification problem as practiced by State DOT is an extreme problem. It's a problem because there's structural bias in the way the regulations are written.

The regulations are biased against women, against Native Alaskans, and against Blacks who are innovative entrepreneurs, against Hispanics who are innovative entrepreneurs. And I say it's structurally biased because I can't believe that everybody in DOT is interpretatively biased against these minority business persons.

Ideally, if you were to take the regulations and the interpretation of regulations apart and look at what is the ideal example of a business that DOT wants to certify, what you'd come up with is small owner-operated construction or janitorial. The regulations

MS. STURGULEWSKI: I'm sorry, construction

MR. GALLELA: Construction or janitorial.

MS. STRUGULEWKSI: Oh, I'm sorry. Thanks.

MR. GALLELA: The regulations are not written to take into account the full spectrum of entrepreneurial activities and innovativeness that Blacks, Hispanics, Natives and women are currently engaged in. It's a question of bureaucrats being handed a set of regulations which simply cannot do the job, and hamstring them.

Now, is DOT aware of this, and are the individuals aware of this? Absolutely, yes. They are absolutely aware of the fact that by regulation they cannot recognize what are de facto bonafide minority firms. And this was brought home to me during a session that I had with the Department of Highway individuals from Washington, D.C. and Department of Highway individuals -- federal Department of Highway individuals stationed in Juneau.

And, it was a frustrating kind of confrontation because we would cite case after case of individuals, bonafide minority, minority individuals, minority businesses wanting to expand as was stated by one of your earlier speakers, wanting to expand into areas that they, themselves, did not have personal expertise in, but like any other good business person in this country could go out and purchase, that is hire someone with the expertise in order get into this new kind of enterprise.

By regulation the DOT cannot recognize that new

1

4

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

capability as being a part of the minority firm, and therefore, that minority firm cannot use that new capability to bid on DOT contracs. This is ludicrous. And we said this. And DOT says, yes, we know, but that is the regulation.

Where's the problem? Is the problem in the legislation? No. The problem is in the writing of the regulations which sits in DOT. And this where you can have an effect. And the Human Rights Commission absolutely can have an effect because you can affect the cabinet level or you can suggest or recommend to the cabinet level. The ex-secretary of Department of Transportation, Elizabeth Dole, did not see fit to change the regulations for reasons we don't have to go into. The new secretary, hopefully, can make that change. And hopefully, in your recommendations -- and you might have to have staff help on this, you might want to go to individuals who testified here today, you might want to go to Louie and the ladies that testified before us, and you might want to come to me for some real actual language and cases on how to structure a suggestion or recommendations. And I, for one, would be happy to do this.

Let me get into a couple of more items on the discrimination that is very important. First of all, before I get off of DOT

MR. SCHAPIRA: I notice you're paging through your notes there and it's obvious that you're being considerate of the fact that we're pressed for time. I want to mention, if I may,

1

3

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

that if you like, you can submit your comments that you have obviously written out and they can be made a part of the record, too. So,

MR. GALLELA: I appreciate that. I'm having a rough time understanding them myself. My letter was notifying me this meeting was mailed yesterday, and I got it in late mail this afternoon. And I thank the Post Office for that. If I were trying to cover a check with a deposit I know they would not be that expeditious. So, I just have rought notes down here today, but I just want to cover two more areas and I'm going to

MR. SCHAPIRA: Okay. But that offer to submit written testimony, as you heard earlier, that our testimony will remain open for a couple of weeks. And I sense that you have a lot to say that's right on.

MR. GALLELA: Okay. Let me give you two more.

State DOT interpretation of Federal DOT regs.

The State DOT gives me the impression that they feel they must religiously accept what the Federal DOT says. I can't buy that.

I can't buy that Senator Stevens would allow the Department of Transportation to take every highway dollar out of the State of Alaska if we, that is the State of Alaska, were to more liberally and more accurately interpret the regulations.

Additionally, the State of Alaska has its own money that it dispenses on all kinds of construction funds and

dispenses through DOT. There is no reason why we have to adhere to any kind of DOT Federal regulations in dispensing that money to minority firms or qualifying different types of firms as minority firms to receive state monies.

Now, let me get down to one case in point that's particularly bothersome to me. And I fought this battle with DOT for all kinds of firms. As I said, female, Hispanic, Black, female Black, Native, et cetera. When that particular bothers me is it seems that Federal DOT is wholesale writing off all of the Native firms in the state of Alaska.

And I'm going to read a quick letter to you and then I will give this portion to the Commission so you can peruse it at your leisure. This letter is from the Alaska Division of the Federal Highway Administration dated September 16, '87 signed by Robert Rudy who's in Juneau, Alaska, but he's with the Federal Highways Department. It's addressed to Pat Borden Civil Rights Coordinator, Alaska DOT/PF Juneau. Dear Miss Borden: Your July 8 letter requested a determination of businesses owned by Native corporations are eligible for the DBE program under the 1987 Surface Transportation Act. Enclosed is a response from our headquarters and region office stating firms which are wholly owned subsidiaries of Native Corporations are not eligible.

That, to me, flies in the face of common logic.

If Natives are, in fact, minorities then by definition, by

jura (ph), by legislation they are minorities according to federal legislation. A business owned by them is a minority owned business. But, the rationale that they've come up with is a convoluted piece of logic utilizing SBA legislation and selectively using the Surface Transportation legislation to come up with an opinion that, I think, has been done with mirrors because they wanted what they -- what -- they wanted the end And I will give this to you so you can research the three letters and the copy of the legislation -- excuse me -regulations attached to see that the -- the findings that they have are really on thin ice, I think. And I think you can do something about it, at least suggestive-wise, at least recommendation-wise because they're clearly writing off our large minority in the state of Alaska and writing off a lot of businesses and causing a lot of my clients a lot of trouble.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm going to conclude by saying that I feel really strongly about economic rights as a part of civil rights because denial of economic rights means a denial of economic power. That helps ensure de facto denial of all other civil rights. And I'm going to leave my business card also with the Commission so that I make sure that I get invited hopefully in a very timely manner to the rest of the hearings that you may have in the future. And I'll include a couple of copies of the letter and the back-u information that I was referring to.

And I appreciate this time to talk with you and

1 give you my comments. And I hope I've been brief enough. 2 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Francis, thank you very much. 3 And I would be most grateful, and I'm sure the Commission would 4 if you felt you could dash off a bit of a letter that could add 5 some, perhaps some specifics. I think your testimony is right on. 6 Were all the comments you were making about 7 the underlying law and the regulations dealing with the U.S. 8 Department of Transportation and not the state regulations? 9 MR. GALLELA: Yes. The comments -- when ever I 10 said regulations I was referring to Federal regulations 11 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Okay. 12 MR. GALLELA: And obviously our people use them, 13 as I said, religiously. 14 MS. STURGULEWSKI: I had never really been aware 15 until today with your comments and the comments of Ms. Bradley 16 about the fact that here we have a program geared to keeping 17 you small, weak and ineffective. I find that bizarre and feel I 18 should have been on top of that and aware. I simply was not. 19 To say that you can't grow in the way corporations 20 and businesses grow is insane. 21 MR. GALLELA: Well, it is insane, but 22 MS. STURGULEWKSI: But Yeah. 23 MR. GALLELA: it's in regulation. 24 MS. STURGULEWSKI: that's something, I think, 25 that among the points that we pick out I think that we really

ought to pick that one out as a major topic. And it's something that we can talk to our congressional delegation and others, you know, or individually we can certainly do that.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SCHAPIRA: On a national level would you support the recommendation that the Federal DOT require each state to promulgate regulations for the certification of minority businesses, and then the Federal DOT accepts those certifications? See, because I don't -- I take it you weren't here for the whole session,

MR. GALLELA: No.

MR. SCHAPIRA: but earlier speakers talked about the problem that they could be certified under these set of regs, not certified under FAA regs, certified under BIA regs but not certified under DOT -- U.S. DOT regs. So, the suggestion has been for, you know, uniform certification procedures.

MR. GALLELA: I think that in answer to your question I think DOT should solicit comments from the states proposed regulations and use those to make a set of regulations that will apply for all federal agencies. I know that all federal agencies don't agree on certification. I'd like to see that standardized and I'd like to see it liberalized in light of what is the new economic reality of what businesses and minority business persons are doing.

On a statewise basis it's unreal how you have to be certified by the Municipality, by DOT, and then maybe by the Department of Administration also. And I certainly would like to see the State get its act together and have a common certification process. And why the Municipality of Anchorage can't buy into it I have no idea.

MR. ALEX: Would you characterize the requirements for all the various certifications as, you know, may be a portion of active discrimination?

MR. GALLELA: I didn't understand that, Mr. Alex.

MR. ALEX: I said would you characterize the requirement for all the certification to be a form of discrmination?

MR. GALLELA: If I were a proponent or advocate of the various conspiracy theories running around I certainly would say yes to that because even if it weren't an active conspiracy like Senator Sturgulewski said, you know, it's insane the way the regs are written, you know, I think it's, at least, a de facto bias and a de facto discrmination. It absolutely is discrimination because it, in fact, holds you down or holds you back. It does not give you your economic rights that you should have. So, in answer to your question yes, de facto it's true.

MR. ALEX: Further questions?

MR. DULLES: Let me just ask you; the source of a lot of these problems enter in Federal regulations, not in the

statute, but in the way that they are interpreted or in the regulatory process of the Federal Department of Transportation, is that right?

MR. GALLELA: I think that's true given my experience. And you know, I have to admit I'm not an attorney and I didn't read the regulations, but given my experience in working with DOT, et cetera, that's what I see. It's in the regulation process itself.

MR. DULLES: Okay. At what point can you delineate between just passing the buck to the federal government and putting some burden on the State of Alaska for addressing and dealing with the problem at the state level, you see, because you get into that, well, if the Feds don't clean their house, then there's nothing we can do. And given the realities of, you know, of circumstances at the federal level it's unlikely that there's going to be a timely resolution. Is there something that can be done at the state level, politically or otherwise, to really expedite the process and get something done that will have some meaningful and positive impact on the state?

MR. GALLELA: I understand the question. It's a very big dilemma, but being an extremely independent Alaskan and entrepreneur myself my stand is, and I've tried to talk with State DOT about this, is we should not be the tail that the dog in Washington, D.C. is wagging. What we should be is standing on our own two feet saying this is how we interpret the

regulations. These are our particular circumstances in Alaska. And these firms are, in fact, minority firms, and this is the way we see it. And instead of reaching back to D.C. for interpretations, judgments, rulings, advice, et cetera as DOT always does. I think DOT/PF here in the state has to take a much stronger stance. And I think it takes the Governor to put some backbone into it and say we don't have to go back for everything, and we don't need readings and rulings on every new case that we have, you know, you are the interpreters of this and you are making policy for this state.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ALEX: Further questions? Yes.

MS. HURLEY: Mr. Chairman, that's exactly why we fought for statehood and that's what makes me angry that we always are still going back to the Feds instead of saying, hey, we are a state and we should stand up to you. We're not -we're right behind, Mr. -- I think we should do it. going to do my little bit from the Human Rights Commission to start

> MR. GALLELA: Thank you.

MR. ALEX: Thank you. I had a question for Arlene while Winston is coming up. One of the things that you said that was a problem was that as a subcontractor you didn't have a contract with the owner. Is that what something that you said?

MS. STURGULEWSKI: That's correct.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

MR. ALEX: Just a little suggestion. And I may be practicing law without a license, but couldn't you, as a subcontractor and your subcontractors in your contract with the prime contractor put in a little clause that says this is, in fact, a contract with the owner?

MS. STURGULEWSKI: You're kind of like asking the child to go to the teacher and correct the teacher. The problem gets to be as I said, when you're in a sub level like I said the general is -- you're at his discretion whether he uses you or not. It can be a matter of economics for him, it can be a matter of a goal setting or whatever else. The problem gets to be there is I have been totally unsuccessful in changing any portion of the AGC general contract to a subcontractors in 10 years. If I were a general I would not change it either. I would leave the retention in. I would leave all of it in. But I am at his, more or less, mercy. I mean I have -- if I want to work I have no other work except through them. I -- they, you know

MR. ALEX: The reason for the question because I -- you know -- I thought that might be the answer. And it would seem like that -- one of the possible solutions may be a state regulation that says, in fact, you know, a subcontract with a general is a contract with the owners, so, you know

MS. STURGULEWSKI: What that does do is it allows you to be able to sell your receivable or -- you know, at this

point in time you are -- you don't have anything to sell to hock to be able to support the project which you want to.

MR. ALEX: Okay. Winston, sorry about that. For the record you can

MR. HENDERSON: Okay. Chairman Alex, Commission, my name is Winston Henderson. I'm speaking today as a small business owner and a concerned citizen. I know we're short on time so I'll be extremely brief. There are a couple of observations that I'd like to share with you.

One, primarily, is a comment on the perception in the MBE community in general regarding DOT. And that is as Mr. Dulles referred to that there's no state initiative at all in wanting to do anything beyond what is minimally required of them in terms of meeting any MBE requirements. And that the State -- DOT, in particular, is being forced kicking and screaming to meet the very minimal requirements, and that they, in fact, bend over backwards to complicate the entire picture and make it as difficult as possible. And I would also hope to see stronger leadership from the Governor's office and the Legislature, and hopefully, create better climate and passing that climate down to DOT to improve their performance.

I'm somewhat disappointed today that DOT was not required to produce more hard statistics and evidence and testimony regarding their past performance over the last two or three years, and to talk in more detail on how they intended to

correct that dismal record. I'm encouraged to see Bob Poe come on board at DOT. We know him to be a sincere and earnest individual, and hope that he will bring about some change there. But, we would also like to see Bob helped along by a more forceful presence from the federal government, from FHA in terms of overseeing how their funds, in fact, are spent here in the state. Also, hopefully, we would like to see a stronger presence coming from the Legislature.

There were concerns expressed regarding certification problems. And we know those exist, but I think that that is getting a disproportionate amount of attention today. That if, in fact, you focus on making work available to MBE's that the certification problems tend to solve themselves. If, in fact, you're able to, in fact, get 10 percent of the federal dollars into MBE hands out into the contracting community, then suddenly you're expanding the whole realm of opportunity that's available and more and more people are able to clearly become certified.

There are already a large number of minority and women owned businesses that are clearly certifiable, that are clearly capable of owning, operating and managing businesses. So, aside from those that you have questions regarding certification it's a much more important issue to get work to those that are able to function now and to keep those businesses viable and alive. If, in fact, the State wanted to be more helpful in those areas we would want to see more programs that

would assist new business owners with estimating, bidding procedures, bonding, and financial assistance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Clearly it's been demonstrated that there are any number of minority individuals who are capable of performing the work on these contracts. Certainly there have been many instances where minority businesses who have been unable to obtain work as prime contractors have ended up doing those very jobs as subcontractors and making nothing on the project. certainly that's something that needs to be addressed. If we can also see some teeth put into the MBE program in terms of enforcement of the regulations that exist now, again, the speaker on subcontracting talked about a lot of the problems that small businesses and minority businesses face once they get a contract. One, they may not receive the amount of a contract dollar amount that was initially reported, or payment is often several weeks, if not months behind. Also, there's a problem with being able to get on a job and perform efficiently.

If, as a painting contractor, you get a project and you need to paint 10,000 square feet a day to be profitable, and yet the prime contractor is piece mealing this out to you at 1,000 square feet a day so that you're setting up for half days and mobilizing and demobilizing and your project ends up getting stretched out two or three times your length, of course, you're not going to succeed. Of course, you can't make any money. And these are problems that are not being addressed.

Finally, again, we would want to see much more involvement from FHA on overseeing how their funds are spent here in the state. It would be our preference to see the Legislature and the Governor's office take a very strong and clear position and not force the federal government to have to look over their shoulders. We're not at all optimistic that that will happen given the recent and longer track record, but that would certainly be ideal. That concludes my comments.

MR. ALEX: Questions?

MS. STURGULEWSKI: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: Yes.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: I'd like to kind of explore a little bit the legislative role that you might see. I can remember a lot of debate when the old office was moved and it's kind of been moved around with different administrations and sort of ends up the same. And it's been difficult to get things through if there's not been a strong commitment on the part of the administration to it. And I just wondered what -- the problems with DOT, I've been in the Legislature since -- started in '79. And we started hammering on DOT, and Bob Poe referred to the horrible, horrible problems. Those have been evident for all the years of the tremendous growth and -- and working as the Human Rights Commission did to get a settlement. But, to try to get -- there's been oversight and threats and anger and all the rest of it, and I've been part of that. And it's always

1 So, I'm not sure, you know, I'd like to respond, the same. 2 but what are those things that the Legislature can be about? I'd 3 love to have those specifics. 4 MR. HENDERSON: Well, I certainly find it 5 frustrating coming from your position, certainly if 6 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Yeah. 7 MR. HENDERSON: you as a Legislator feel 8 unable to wield any pressure on DOT what 9 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Oh, Lord. We've tried. 10 MR. HENDERSON: does that say to the citizens 11 out here? 12 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Yeah. Yeah. I was just 13 wondering, you know, Mr. Henderson, if there were specifics that 14 you saw that we could do because there has been a real effort as late as, you know, '85 -'86 with ongoing legislative audit 15 16 reports that people are shocked, and you call in the Commissioner, 17 and it stays the same. 18 MR. HENDERSON: I think one specific thing that is 19 possible from both the Legislature and FHA, and it would probably 20 be painful for the State, is to send down a strong edict that if, in fact, you're not meeting these set goals, then we're going 21 22 to look at holding funding on future projects or projects in 23 And I think you would be pleasantly surprised were that works. 24 to happen how quickly the problems would clear up. 25 MS. STURGULEWSKI: I don't want to get into a

debate, I appreciate that, but when they're so fouled up what

you're doing is further delay in meeting requirements of the federal government to get the funding, and you hurt -- the people get hurt by the programs

MR. HENDERSON: I agree. It would be very painful, but I also strongly stress that that is one way to get them really moving.

MR. SCHAPIRA: You strongly favor the use of quotas, is that correct?

MR. HENDERSON: I have mixed feelings on quotas. However, I look at the establishment of quotas for Alaska hire. There are quotas for Alaska products. So, I guess it depends on whose quota it is, and that kind of determines whether it's seen in a negative light. I think that quotas are necessary initially to open markets up and to provide opportunities. I don't think that they have to be an unending situation if, in fact, the State or whomever is running the program goes into it with clear, concise ideas on what they want to accomplish and how they intend to accomplish these goals so that it's not just an open ended program.

Yes, I do favor quotas in this instance.

MR. SCHAPIRA: And I take it that your endorsement of quotas is contingent upon the notion that they are temporary measures aimed at opening markets, that at the outset they are limited in duration, and that they have escape clauses for instances where through no one's fault, through no operation of

3

4

5

7

6

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

prejudice, through no mendacity, they can't be met, is that correct?

MR. HENDERSON: Certainly. And I would add to that list that they are being managed in a fashion meant to assist those taking advantage of the quotas to succeed ultimately, and to graduate away from the need of them.

MR. ALEX: In other words, would you say that the intent of the MBEWBE laws are not being met?

MR. HENDERSON: Oh, I think that's very clear just looking at the record, that's very evident.

MR. DULLES: Well, let me ask this question because the federal highway people and DOT people when I asked them if they're meeting their goal, well, the 10 percent goal is being exceeded, that it's 11.7 percent of all these federal contracts are going to MBE's. And for women, I think, the goal is 2 percent, and it's 2.9 percent that's actually being awarded though. The record that they provide indicates that they're exceeding their goals. Based on everything we've heard today how -- how are they able to establish such an excellent track record (indiscernible - interrupted)

MR. HENDERSON: I have questions on their record keeping. And I would certainly want to see their documentation very closely. I'd like to examine the documentation very closely.

MR. DULLES: Well, there needs to be accountability.

MR. HENDERSON: Certainly.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. DULLES: So, if they're saying it's 11.7 percent, then they ought to be able to demonstrate who's getting the contracts and how it's working so that they're able to succeed in meeting their goal.

MR. ALEX: I was just thinking an agency that doesn't know whether it has three billion dollars or not hardly can be trusted to go and give an accurate figure with respect to goals.

MR. HENDERSON: I think, again, what we're really talking about here is attitude, and whether or not there's a sincere desire to see these programs succeed. I think the best measure on the success of the program would be that it ultimately would not be needed again. And I don't see that as being any where near a goal that this administration has.

MR. GUITIERREZ: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ALEX: Yes.

MR. GUITIERREZ: I just have a comment for you,
John. It appears like, you know, DOT does has some contracts out
in the Bush. They're primarily Native villages. They do
contract out clearing airports and roads. And it may be that
those minority businesses out there, those individuals, although
they're not businesses they're individuals, obscure (ph) the
statistics because, you see, in terms of a construction project
in town it would have to be very clearly laid out prior to the
bidding process, it seems to me

MR. HENDERSON: I have another concern along those same lines. I believe that Native firms should certainly receive all the benefits of an MBE program. However, I have concerns that a multi-million dollar Native corporation who forms a joint venture, 51 percent joint venture with a non-Native firm, say a concrete company, and that concrete company, in turn, as a minority business does three million dollars worth of business on a project, and suddenly, you now have inflated MBE numbers when, in fact, that concrete firm may not be operated by or may not employ a single Native or other minority. And I have real problems with that type of situation.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Well, wouldn't the award of that contract enure to the benefit of a large number of individuals of minority status, namely the shareholders in that minority corporation?

MR. HENDERSON: I wouldn't say that that is not the case, but I believe in defining minority businesses. Typically there's a definition there about owned and operated. And I think that there should be some participation from that minority owner rather than to form a joint venture without having any participation at all.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Well, in the example that you gave the wholly owned subsidiary of a Native corporation that co-ventures with a

MR. HENDERSON: This was not a wholly owned

situation, but a 51 percent joint venture 1 MR. SCHAPIRA: Okay. Better yet then. 2 MR. HENDERSON: There's a distinction there. 3 MR. SCHAPIRA: In that case isn't it possible 4 that the revenue from that and the income that that contract 5 generates in that co-venture or joint venture generates will be 6 used to -- for educational purposes, illimosinary (ph) purposes 7 or whatever to the benefit of minority members to help integrate 8 them into the business community? 9 MR. HENDERSON: Anything is possible, but my 10 concern rests primarily with minority business development. 11 we're talking about helping businesses to develop, I think there 12 may be times when that concern takes precedent over stockholders 13 or shareholders of a corporation; however, I think we're looking -14 possibly looking at a different situation if you have a fully 15 owned subsidiary. 16 MR. SCHAPIRA: And elaborate on that if you would 17 kindly. 18 MR. HENDERSON: I think at that point perhaps 19 20 21

the corporation begins to exercise much more control, much more legitimate control and participation with the subsidiary than exists in a joint venture situation where it may not be a true minority business, but merely a joining for convenience sake to exploit the MBE laws (ph).

MR. DULLES: A fronting, so to speak.

25

24

22

23

3

5

7

9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

2324

25

MR. HENDERSON: That's true.

MR. DULLES: Is what you seem to be describing.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: A fronting is what it was. A

fronting (ph).

MR. ALEX: I was just thinking back, I was just going to say before you leave one of the things, you know, the record will be open for a couple of weeks. So, if you have people that want to submit something for the record we could send it off to John down in California.

MS. BRADLEY: Yes, I was thinking as I was sitting here I was thinking about one of, I think, what is a success story in state government. And that would be the contracts through the Alaska State Power Authority. And I will be in touch with their lawyer who used to be our lawyer at the Human Rights Commission to see if she can gather some information, and talk about what strategies they used. They were operating from an administrative order. And they had in place MBE. And they had requirements that seemed to work well for them. And I think that would be a model that, perhaps, we could look at.

The other piece of information I was thinking of submitting to you was a memorandum of advice from Sara Cavisharro (ph) concerning MBE and the legal requirements to -- in a case where there would be litigation against a program. So, I'll try to gather some information for your use and information.

MR. HENDERSON: Thanks very much.

MR. ALEX: I want to just add some comment with respect to this DBE thing. I, you know, hear MBE, WE, and DBE, and my interpretation of that and without having looked at the regulation, it would appear DBE stands for disadvantage. And I think if you're talking about a multi-million subsidiary you're hardly disadvantaged.

MR. HENDERSON: I would agree with you 100 percent.

MR. ALEX: Yeah. I think that there's a distinction there. And the reason DBE designation, at least in my own view, is that, you know, here's a -- you know, here's a regulation that is intended to get disadvantaged people and businesses into the business world. And it isn't intended for multi-million dollar subsidiaries which cannot be classed as disadvantaged.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Isn't it true, Mr. Chairman, that they can be classified as disadvantaged in the sense that they haven't had access to courses in management, and that they have to rely on outside consultants heavily, and they don't have established contacts in the old boy network (ph) because of past discriminatory acts? Money is a great thing, but it doesn't compensate for everything else.

MR. HENDERSON: I think those are real concerns, but in the real world of how MBE programs are handled now you

dollar constant of the second of the second

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

see the inflated numbers that get generated by large multi-million dollar corporations doing multi-million dollar projects. In fact, penalizing legitimate small minority businesses. If, in fact, Department of Transportation can say we've exceeded our goal because we had a million dollars worth of concrete work performed by a large firm, then why bother to hire all of these other small firms, which, in fact, are owner-operated and are attempting to function?

Certainly, I would not like to see

MR. SCHAPIRA: That's a very well taken point.

MR. HENDERSON: any business penalized, but the way that the numbers are going to be manipulated, and given the attitude of those who are operating the MBE program it makes it difficult.

MR. ALEX: Further questions? Any comments?

MR. DULLES: Is there an association or an organization of MBE's in this state?

MR. HENDERSON: At one time there was an association of minority contractors. I'm sure it's still in existence, although the number of minority contractors is shrinking rapidly just as the number of contractors in general are shrinking rapidly, much more so because of, of course, the MBE situation.

MR. DULLES: It just appears to me that maybe,.

you know, you could exercise a little bit more leverage if you
were somehow organized into an interest group, if you know

what I'm saying. I mean the AGC is over here at the Convention Center and they're influencing a lot of things. They're state people up here meeting with them all the time. And obviously, minority businesses may not have that kind of clout 'cause they don't have that kind of money, but at least through an organization with some agendas

MR. HENDERSON: You're correct

MR. DULLES: (indiscernible - interrupted) a political process that you could avail yourselves of.

MR. HENDERSON: You're correct. Minority businesses do not have that type of economic power now. And as Mr. Overstreet stated earlier, a suit was brought against DOT some years ago to attempt to bring more pressure to bear. And of course, that has not resulted in any significant improvement.

MR. ALEX: One of the things that I said earlier was monitoring, you know, monitoring was part of the process of getting relief. I assume that your group is monitoring DOT, you know, on this -- on these matters?

MR. HENDERSON: Unofficially, yes, we do. We try to get access to their numbers on MBE usage, which have not been typically available or very well compiled. We also informally try to network with other minority businesses to be aware of any opportunities that are coming up, or if any other businesses are getting contracts on any state work.

MR. ALEX: Mitch.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Would it be fair to say that following up on Chairman Alex's comments and your own thoughts on the thing, that one recommendation that you would make if the Secretary of Transportation were to consult you for your recommendation would be that better reporting techniques be developed to look behind just the label minority business, and to look at and -- and the creation of different classifications, developing minority businesses, merging minority businesses, and et cetera?

MR. HENDERSON: I think that would be helpful. It would probably be far more complicated at this stage of development than would be practical. I could see that being the next phase of MBE usage as we got more businesses involved in the MBE program and it began to run a lot smoother. But, at this point we're at square one.

MR. ALEX: Thank you. Further questions? Comments?

MR. SCHAPIRA: Thanks a lot. We appreciate your

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you.

MR. ALEX: I'm going to make a closing statement here. The focus of today's proceeding has been the civil rights issues relating to state and municipal efforts designed to promote participation of minority and women's business

enterprises in governmental contracting. As a first step in the Advisory Committee study today we have heard from public and private groups, and organizations as well as individuals knowledgeable of the study area. We will review the transcript of the meeting and talk with additional individuals and groups, and will submit our findings and recommendations to the Commission in Washington, D.C., and to our state leaders for their consideration.

The Advisory Committee would like to thank all those who have participated here.

MR. SCHAPIRA: Chairman Alex, I'd like to address the next step. There was some discussion earlier about what is our timetable. And I think Mr. Dulles was correct in saying that this problem probably won't be solved by the springtime. But, my concern is that another problem may come up between now and the springtime that will demand our attention at that time.

And I'd like to achieve some closure on this. Therefore, what I would propose along the lines that we discussed before lunch is that a report be circulated, a draft report, and that those people who feel that they could sign on to the draft report do so, and those people who have dissenting comments or separate comments if they would like to add, prepare those, and then after that draft is circulated and returned to Mr. Dulles his staff can prepare a final report, and that thereafter it could be forwarded up to the Commission.

And I don't 1 MR. ALEX: Procedurally, I don't -- I think that's 2 a very good plan of action. 3 MS. STURGULEWSKI: I'd second that if it's 4 appropriate. 5 MR. ALEX: Okay. Any objections? 6 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Mr. Chairman? 7 MR. ALEX: Yes. 8 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Before that I would hope 9 that when this comes to us that we would be asked by -- so that 10 we could all have our memories jogged and so on, to have some 11 suggestions from the committee members as to who they would like 12 the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to distribute the report to. 13 In other words, if we feel it particularly goes to the Department 14 of Transportation, Department of Commerce, Congressional --15 certain Congressional leaders, certain state officials, I think 16 that would be very useful to Mr. Dulles in, perhaps, drafting a 17 cover letter to the Commission. 18 MR. SCHAPIRA: That would be part of our 19 recommendations to the U.S. Commission, I agree. 20 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Does that sound 21 Mr. ALEX: Okay. 22 MR. DULLES: I have no problems with the process. 23 What you're not going to like is the timetable. 24 MS. STURGULEWSKI: Of course not. 25

MR. DULLES: It's not going to be expeditious. 1 And I would be less than fair and candid if I told you otherwise. 2 MR. ALEX: Okay. Do we have 3 MR. DULLES: We have forms going back to at least 4 last June, which we have transcripts on, which reports have not 5 yet been developed on. And that is we simply, absolutely do not 6 have the research writers, we don't have editors, we don't even have at this point a secretary in our office. So, I'm just being very, very upfront up with you. MS. STURGULEWSKI: 10 MR. DULLES: The process I have no problems 11 12 13 14

with, but unless somehow we can prevail on someone somewhere to get additional resources to support these Advisory Committee functions you're going to find that the process is not going to be timely. And that's unfortunate, but it's -- at least right now that's the reality. And I don't know what -- you know -what we can do about it.

MS. STURGULEWSKI: What's the budget for the next year, Mr. Dulles.

MR. DULLES: We don't -- well, we're under a continuing resolution,

> MS. STURGULEWSKI: All right.

MR. DULLES: which runs out next week, November the 10th. So, we'll either go out of business or we will receive some kind of a negotiated settlement between the

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 House and the Senate. And right now the speculation is that it 2 will be 5.95 million, which will represent an additional cut on 3 top of the 40 percent cut that we took last year. The Commission 4 dropped from 12 -- from a possibly 12 million to 7.6 million. 5 closed seven of our 10 regional offices. And at that 7.6 million that's what we've been operating on. And if we get funded for 7 this coming year, for the current fiscal year, the likelihood 8 is that it will not -- well, I can almost assure you it will not be above 5.95 million dollars, which is an additional 10 cut of -- I don't have the percentage right at hand, but 11 MR. SCHAPIRA: I think you can be assured 12 you'd get the bill from the Court Reporter before the 10th. 13 MR. ALEX: Is there any way no -- 14 (Simultaneous conversation) 15 MR. ALEX: I was going to say the motion had 16 passed, you know, on the process. 17 MR. DULLES: On the process I have, you know, 18 but at least I'm on record here in terms of what our situation 19 is 20 MR. ALEX: Yes. 21 MR. DULLES: plus, Gil wants to write 22 another report. 23 MR. ALEX: Okay. 24 MR. GUITIERREZ: I don't have any problem 25 tentatively doing that. I mean I'm tentatively saying I can do

1	that. I can do that, you know, on my own time. I don't have any					
2	problem with that. What we'll do is let's wait until the					
3	transcripts come back. We'll talk to each other through Dan or					
4	we can each other. If we can kind of just put it together for me,					
5	then let me review it and make a decision. I don't see a problem.					
6	MR. DULLES: There might be a way creative					
7	MR. GUITIERREZ: I think it's possible.					
8	MR. DULLES: way of doing it more quickly.					
9	MS. STURGULEWSKI: Sure. Sure.					
10	MR. DULLES: But it's going to depend on help					
11	from you. I'll be you know I've just					
12	MS. STURGULEWSKI: Yeah.					
13	MR. DULLES: got to be honest					
14	MS. STURGULEWSKI: If we've got the deal where					
15	I mean among those groups					
16	MR. DULLES: If everybody has a transcript					
17	MS. STURGULEWSKI: Yeah.					
18	MR. DULLES: and we can get some comments					
19	and some notes, and maybe with some help from one or two Advisory					
20	Committees					
21	MS. STURGULEWSKI: Yes.					
22	MR. DULLES: put something together, maybe					
23	we can short cut it, but					
24	MR. SCHAPIRA: And I suspect strongly that Janet					
25	will be very helpful, too, and will make her services she's					

a very helpful person generally. 1 MR. GUITIERREZ: That may be very -- that may be 2 a good way of looking at it, because they certainly do have 3 MS. STURGULEWSKI: We will not die and go away 4 MR. GUITIERREZ: typing support. Right. 5 MS. STURGULEWSKI: today. 6 MR. ALEX: Do we have any other closing statements 7 before we adjourn? 8 MR. DULLES: I want to thank the members of the 9 Committee. You're all volunteers. And it's been a long day. I 10 think it's been a very, very good meeting, but -- we certainly 11 commend you because this is the really the part of the Commission, 12 I think, that is right now the most valued by the Congress is 13 the State Advisory Committee network. 14 MR. SCHAPIRA: At these rates how could they 15 complain? 16 MR. DULLES: That's -- I was going to conclude by 17 18 saying they've got a pretty good deal. Don't submit a bill 19 for your consultant services. But, I do appreciate very, very 20 much your interest and your service on the Committee. 21 Any further comments? Okay. This MR. ALEX: 22 meeting is adjourned. 23 (END OF PROCEEDINGS) 24 25

CERTIFICATE

UNITED	STATES	OF	AMERICA)	
STATE (OF ALAS	KA)	SS

I, Suzan Kay Olson, Notary Public in and for the State of Alsaka and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify;

THAT the annexed and foregoing minutes of the Alaska Advisory Committee meeting was taken before me on the 6th day of November, 1987, commencing at the hour of 1:00 o'clock p.m. at the Federal Building in Anchorage, Alaska.

THAT the testimony is a true and correct transcription taken by me and thereafter transcribed by myself.

THAT the original of the minutes has been lodged with the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Western Regional Division, Los Angeles, California with Mr. John Dulles, II.

THAT I am not a relative, employee, or attorney of any of the parties, nor am I financially interested in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 3rd day of December, 1987.

Notary Aublic in and for Alaska

My Commission Expires: 4/30/90

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25