

**TO: WIB Executive Committee**

**DATE: 9/20/04**

**FROM: WIB Staff**

**For Action**

**For Information**

**For Discussion**

**SUBJECT: Workforce Development Advocacy**

**PROPOSED MOTION(S): Information/Discussion Only**

**DISCUSSION:** In light of the California Performance Review (CPR) it is vitally important and crucial for WIB members to send letters to advocate for local control of Workforce Development. The letters should be addressed to Victoria Bradshaw, the CPR Commission, Senator Denham and Assembly Person Matthews. The letters should be on your own business letterhead. Please provide a copy of your letter to WIB staff, so they can be forwarded to the California Workforce Association as they support our local effort.

WIBs are being encouraged by the CWA to develop a resolution for the Board of Supervisors to adopt that supports local control for Workforce Development. CWA will supply common language for LWIBs to consider for the resolution.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**

**Sample Letter from John Heading**

**Addresses for the letters**

**CPR Resolution**



**WORKFORCE  
INVESTMENT BOARD**  
MERCED COUNTY

John Heading, Chair  
Nellie McGarry, 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair  
Mike Sullivan, 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair  
1880 West Wardrobe Ave. Merced, CA 95340  
Phone (209)725-3593 FAX (209)725-3592  
[www.co.merced.ca.us/pitd/wib/wib.html](http://www.co.merced.ca.us/pitd/wib/wib.html)

August 26, 2004

CPR Commission  
Office of the Governor  
Constituent Affairs, State Capitol  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Commissioners:

I have had a career as a hospital administrator and presently work as a pharmacist, business owner, and adjunct professor. I have been a member of the Merced County Workforce Investment Board (WIB) for five years. For two years, I served as the WIB's Vice Chairman and am currently in my second year as the Chairman.

I am writing to express my concern with and objection to the California Performance Review's (CPR) recommendation that the Governor reduce the number of Workforce Investment Boards in the state from 50 to between 20 and 30 (Section GG23 of the CPR Report). The overall purpose of CPR, as I understand it, was to look for ways to make government more efficient and effective, objectives I agree with. However, this recommendation is at odds with what is best for customers, businesses and communities, and misses critical context and the purpose of California's local workforce investment system. Furthermore, making Workforce Boards less locally based would result in a loss of local funds leveraged to support workforce and economic development efforts, and the loss of engagement of businesses around the state that value the connection their WIBs have with their communities.

The Merced County WIB serves as a cogent force for the alignment of public, private, civic and human capital—resources instrumental to addressing a broad range of economic and workforce development issues in our area. Our Board's deployment of Business Services professionals to develop relationships with our local Economic Development offices, Chambers of Commerce and businesses is critical to the implementation of a comprehensive economic strategy for our County. Our WIB's involvement in the Merced County Office of Education's Preschool-Post Secondary Education Council provides an educational focus that is relevant to key businesses and industry sectors, and therefore future job opportunities.

I serve on the WIB because there I can affect my community in ways that improve the business climate, improve the bottom-line for companies like mine, and ensure the economic vitality of Merced County. I also serve because I care about my community—I live there, I am a business owner and parent, I want to sustain a great quality of life in Merced, and I also want the best education system for my family, one that prepares them for tomorrow's jobs.

This local connection will be lost by the establishment of fewer, larger Workforce Investment Areas whose boundaries are drawn in Sacramento as the CPR recommendation suggests. This is certainly not the right answer for all communities in this geographically, demographically and economically diverse state. The design and delivery of local workforce systems—systems that are genuinely responsive to business demands and the needs of jobseekers—must occur at the local level.

Respectfully,



John Heading, Chairman  
Merced County Workforce Investment Board

*"Merced County's Workforce Investment system will keep pace with the new growth, the emerging economy, and the ever changing needs of the employers by creating a better educated, highly skilled workforce, that's capable, and prepared, and thoroughly knowledgeable."*

## **Addresses for CPR Advocacy Letters**

**CPR Commission  
Office of the Governor  
Constituent Affairs, State Capitol  
Sacramento, CA 95814**

**Victoria Bradshaw, Secretary of Labor  
California Labor & Workforce Development Agency  
801 K Street, Suite 2101  
Sacramento, CA 95814**

**Jeff Denham  
State Capitol, Rm 4062  
Sacramento, CA 95814**

**Barbara Matthews  
State Capitol, Rm 5155  
Sacramento, CA 95814**

# OAKLAND CITY COUNCIL

RESOLUTION No. \_\_\_\_\_ C.M.S.

---

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE CITY OF OAKLAND'S CONTINUED DESIGNATION AS A  
WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREA AND OPPOSING CALIFORNIA PERFORMANCE  
REVIEW SECTION GG23, A RECOMMENDATION TO REALIGN AND CONSOLIDATE  
WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREAS AND BOARDS**

**WHEREAS**, the City of Oakland has "Temporary" designation as a Workforce Investment Area as defined under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998 due to the City's population base of under 500,000 residents; and

**WHEREAS**, the City receives WIA formula and discretionary funding directly from the State and has its own Workforce Investment Board appointed by the Mayor to oversee programs and set local policies for the use of WIA funds in Oakland; and

**WHEREAS**, California Performance Review Section GG23 recommends the realignment and consolidation of 20 to 30 Workforce Investment Areas, targeting areas that have fewer than 500,000 residents; and

**WHEREAS**, a consolidation would in all probability result in a significant loss of funding and autonomy for Oakland workforce development programs and services; now, therefore be it

**RESOLVED:** That the best interests of the City of Oakland would be served by continuing Oakland's designation as a Workforce Investment Area; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** That the City Council of the City of Oakland opposes the recommendation in Section GG23 of the California Performance Review to realign and consolidate Workforce Investment Areas and Boards; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED:** That the City Council hereby authorizes and directs the City Administrator or her designee to submit letters to the Governor and the State Legislature that will actively express to State officials the City's opposition to said recommendation, and take other action with respect to the issue consistent with this Resolution and its basic purposes.

IN COUNCIL, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_\_

**PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:**

AYES- BROOKS, BRUNNER, CHANG, NADEL, QUAN, REID, WAN and PRESIDENT DE LA FUENTE

NOES-

ABSENT-

ABSTENTION-

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_

CEDA FLOYD  
City Clerk and Clerk of the Council  
of the City of Oakland, California