

**Merced County Workforce Investment Board  
Planning and Policy Development Committee  
Merced County Department of Business-Economic Opportunities  
2000 "M" Street, Merced, CA  
October 17, 2001, 3:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes**

---

**Members Present:** Andrea Baker, Nick Benjamin, George Brown, Harry Dull, Peter Fluetsch (Chair), Brian Griffin, Grover Omyer

**Members Absent:** Carol Greenberg, John Fowler

**PITD Staff Present:** Sylvia Gonzalez, Ed McLaughlin, Dick Skarke

**Others Present:** Leo Lamb

---

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call** - The Chair called the meeting to order. A sign-in sheet was used in lieu of roll call.

**2. Approve Agenda** – It was M/S/C Fluetsch/Baker to approve the agenda with the addition of the WIB/CLEO Agreement as a discussion item.

**3. Approval of Minutes** – It was *M/S/C Griffin/Dull* to approve the September 26, 2001 minutes.

**4. Opening Comments from the Chair** – The Chair thanked everyone for attending and noted Mr. Leo Lamb was present to discuss the WIB/CLEO Agreement.

**5. Public Opportunity to Speak** – Copies of the WIB/CLEO agreement were provided to the committee. Mr. Lamb voiced concerns regarding the terminology of the item #4.A.6, 4.B.2, and 4.D.5&6. He also suggested some added items, i.e. 4.B.10, 4.B. 11, and 4.B. 12.

The following summarizes the discussion with Mr. Lamb and the committee:

**4. A. 6:** "Review and approval of the budget for the local Workforce Investment System". Mr. Lamb asked if the budget was local WIB funding or is that PITD? Ms. Baker explained the budget referred to the funding received in the following categories:

- a. WIA Title I Funding for Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth Programs,
- b. Welfare to Work,
- c. Rapid Response, and
- d. Carryover and incentive funds.

PITD has been designated the administrative entity and the One-Stop Operator and therefore a portion of the "budget" would be allocated to PITD. The WIB and Youth

Council also receive portions of the budget. Mr. Lamb then asked the following questions:

- a. What happened to the trucks and machinery that were purchased?
- b. Do we still have accountability for the equipment that was purchased over the years?

Ms. Baker noted that when JTPA closed out, there was an opportunity to abandon all equipment in place that was valued under \$500 through County General Services. The two trucks (18 wheelers) were put in County storage since Merced College is no longer offering a truck driver class. Ms. Baker stated accountability is maintained over equipment that has been purchased over the years.

It was recommended that an Appendix be added to the agreement that would define the following:

- a. Workforce Investment System,
- b. Workforce Delivery System,
- c. One Stop Delivery System,
- d. Add a flow chart showing the relationships, and
- e. Individual training account and other appropriate definitions.

**4.B.2.** “Conduct strategic oversight of the Workforce Delivery System”. Mr. Lamb suggested this sentence also includes One-Stop partners and vendors. It was determined by the committee with the addition of an appendix (definitions) this add-on would not be necessary.

Mr. Lamb suggested add-ons as follows:

- 4.B.10:** Provide CLEO staffing and support needs for WIB operation.
- 4.B.11:** In cooperation with the CLEO, conduct an overall evaluation of the entity selected by the WIB and the CLEO to provide staffing and support to the WIB.
- 4.B.12:** Meet with CLEO representative prior to each fiscal year to agree to the amount of WIB funds used by the County for payroll, purchasing and other county services requested by the WIB and CLEO.

Mr. Lamb suggested that these add-ons would require rephrasing, however, his main concern was there should be some oversight and/or authority for the WIB in the selection of WIB staff. Plus under JTPA, the chair of the Private Industry Council, along with the PITD Director, would meet yearly with the County to determine administrative costs for payroll, etc. (A87 costs) and this should be reflected in the agreement.

**4. D 5:** Provide staff to the local WIB, Youth Council and other committees.

**4.D.6:** Select and have staff provide the administrative and programmatic support necessary to carryout the local WIB’s plans and policies.

Mr. Lamb said that these items have been discussed before and he felt if the WIB has oversight over the Administrative entity (PITD) then the agreement should reflect the scope of the oversight. Mr. Lamb thanked the committee for allowing him to speak, and asked that they take these items under consideration.

The Committee, then discussed the various issues raised by Mr. Lamb and recommended the following:

- a. Add an appendix with definitions
- b. The area regarding oversight and WIB staffing are appropriate as written. The PITD Director, will continue to involve WIB members on interview panels for the selection of WIB staff; however; the final selection will be made by the PITD Director.

The Committee directed staff to make the appropriate changes to the CLEO/WIB agreement and these changes will be an action item at their next meeting

**6. Determination of Occupations in Demand:** The regulations state that training services will be directly linked to occupations in demand in the local area, an area where a person will relocate, or the local board can, from time to time, approve training for occupations that they feel are in demand. At the last meeting the committee was given three LMI reports (State LMI, ERISS, and our local LMI representative) showing the top 20 demand occupations. This item was tabled at that time, and it was recommended the job developers provide input for demand occupations.

The Chair read a note from Mr. John Fowler regarding this item, which states, “I discussed the occupations in question with the economic developers throughout the County on October 4, 2001. They generally support the Merced listing as being most accurate.” Mr. Fowler provided the Chair a listing of the most sought after positions. It was M/S/C by Griffin/Omyer to recommend the Occupations in Demand policy be sent to the Workforce Investment Board for approval, (see attached WIB Staff paper subject: Determination of “Occupation in Demand”).

**7. Review of Individual Training Account (ITA) Policy** – The current ITA policy was approved April 20, 2000. Staff noted there are a number of items requiring attention:

- a. References to PITD should be changed to reflect PITD’s multiple roles
- b. Current language does not anticipate “sufficient funds” and resultant lack of statutory priority.
- c. Current language defining “low income individual” is redundant.
- d. Entire document (ITA approach, current non-statutory priority scheme. ITA amount cap, time limits, out of area training conditions, etc..) needs to be ratified or changed in view of the Committee’s current policy inclinations.

Staff stated the average ITA cap in other areas is approximately \$5,000. The committee felt a cap would be appropriate, but allow for extenuating circumstances to go beyond the cap. The committee directed staff to make the suggested changes to the ITA policy and this will be an action item for the next meeting.

**8.** Agenda item for next meeting is to elect/appoint a Vice Chair.

**9. Adjournment** – The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The next meeting will be November 28, 2001, at 3 p.m., at the Merced County Department of Business Economic Opportunities, 2000 M. Street, Merced, CA.

Attachment: WIB Staff paper October 17, 2001.

Minutes Prepared by Sylvia Gonzalez