

# Workforce Investment Board

City of Merced

Samuel Pipes Meeting Room

678 West Main Street

November 13, 2003, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes



**WORKFORCE  
INVESTMENT BOARD**  
MERCED COUNTY

---

## Members Present:

Paul Aderete  
Don Bergman  
Kathleen Crookham  
Scott Galbraith  
Doug Kirkpatrick  
Carole Roberds  
Mike Sullivan

Lee Andersen  
Bob Bittner  
Harry Dull  
Jeremiah Greggains  
Charlie Lambert  
Al Romero  
Steve Tinetti

Andera Baker  
Sharon Cresswell  
John Fowler  
John Heading  
Gisela Malone  
Mike Smith

## Members Absent:

Nicolas Benjamin  
Ernie Flores  
Brian Griffin  
Ned Miller  
Terry Nichols  
Alfonse Peterson

Mike Boardman  
Peter Fluetsch  
Robert Harmon  
Albert Montejano  
Rick Osorio  
Helen Sullivan

Ben Duran  
Carol Greenberg  
Nellie McGarry  
Anne Newins  
Ana Pagan  
Thomas Tsubota

## Others Present:

Michelle Allison  
Eddie Harding  
Donna Ornelas

Elaine Craig  
Teresa Machado  
Joanne Presnell

Dave Davis  
Holly Newlon  
Jackie Walther-Parnell

- 
- I. Call to Order – Meeting was called to order by Chair, John Heading.
  - II. Introduction of New WIB Member – Jeremiah Greggains is the WIB's newest member, he is on the Quality Assurance Committee, represents Labor and is the President, Communications Workers of America, Local 9407.
  - III. Approval of Agenda – It was *M/S/C Tinetti/Crookham* to change the agenda item IX a. to “Follow up from the September 2003 Regional Strategic Issue Presentation”
  - IV. Approval of Minutes – It was *M/S/C Crookham/Roberds* to approve the minutes of September 11, 2003 and October 7, 2003.
  - V. Public Opportunity to Speak – None.
  - VI. Consent Agenda – It was *M/S/C Fowler/Bergman* to approve the Consent agenda
    - a. Self- Sufficiency Wage
    - b. Worknet Certification
    - c. Out-of-School Youth Contract
  - VII. Regional Strategic Issues – “Issues In Economic Development Panel” - Scott Galbraith, Tim Miller, John Fowler, Scott McBride

Scott Galbraith noted there are two components affecting the central valley economic development. The first being the barriers to economic development to include an anti-business image in California and secondly, Mr. Galbraith noted that during the recent Manufacturing Summit, businesses revealed the issues they were dealing with such as outrageous workers comp, rising medical costs for employers, and escalating prices of raw materials. He noted that economic development professionals from the area are working with businesses and identifying opportunities for business in California. Mr. Galbraith discussed the 5-year economic development plan and how the plan addresses the need to build on education and workforce to truly make economic development successful. This strategy requires a collaborative approach between many organizations.

Scott McBride discussed that \$1.5 billion is needed for infrastructure to support economic development. Each community has to set up ways to raise the money to pay for the added expense related to the needed infrastructure, such as storm drains, roads and business parks. Atwater has developer impact fees.

Tim Miller discussed economic development in Los Banos/Westside. He noted that Los Banos/Westside area is the fastest growing community in the county. He noted revitalization is equally important as development of new industry. The main industries for growth are retail, commercial and residential. Lastly Mr. Miller noted the need to focus on retention and expansion of existing businesses and identify growing opportunity in labor.

John Fowler discussed economic development as it relates to the county overall. Mr. Fowler noted that there were five dynamics impacting economic development – Westside push, Northside push, UC Merced, Castle re-use, and commercial retail growth. Mr. Fowler noted that recent research has been done on successful economic development. The areas studied used cooperative agreements with neighboring cities and communities for infrastructure, shared resources, and private equity investment. In addition, some of the models used Government partnering with private sector and shared revenues. It was also noted that it was important to change the perception of the county/community. The area needs to be recognized as a destination as opposed to a gateway.

Mr. Headding recapped the presentation and noted the renewed emphasis on collaboration. Mr. Headding asked the panel to identify two ideas each that would help change economic development. The ideas were as follows:

- Change perception of who we are – praise what we do well
- Continue collaborative efforts and look for new partners
- Input from diverse areas to identify barriers and cooperatively solve issues
- Be hopeful
- Cooperative efforts to look at the job/housing balance and create business opportunities
- Develop skilled workforce
- Dispel the myth of workforce – high unemployment – it was noted there are no measures for underground workforce

- Policy makers of the county to seek solutions for equity capitol investment.
- Promote Merced as the alternative to leaving the state.

The session was then opened up for question and answer period.

Q. How do we make the “affordable alternative to moving out of state” a reality?

A. Investors for commercial and industrial.

Q. What is happening with National Guard at Castle?

A. Still waiting for decision from Washington. It is a 50/50 proposition.

Q. What is happening with the Master Developer?

A. The recommendation has been sent to the BOS and is expected to be considered at the meeting next week.

Q. How do you maintain the character of the community with anticipated growth?

A. The City Council in Los Banos has design standards for amenities in neighborhoods. Additionally, there is a downtown revitalization strategy for industrial growth and development strategies measure quality/character.

Q. How do you build schools to be included as part of planning infrastructure?

A. The residential developers are not opposed to building schools. The regulations to build are very strict and prohibitive. It would be best to encourage bond measures.

Q. Has there been any study done to defer development fees to encourage more development?

A. To an extent this is a current practice, however sometimes not cost effective. In addition there are restrictions on the perceived gifts of funds and often the resources are needed to pay staff to ensure compliance.

Q. Is there a way to structure the permitting process to favor targeted development?

A. Developers already abide by regulatory process. The key is to identify the benefits of the community to attract developers – marketing.

VIII. Advocacy Report – Andrea Baker gave an update and noted that Congress House passed its 4<sup>th</sup> continuing resolution and it is anticipated the omnibus reconciliation bill will move forward to pass allocation for next year. Ms. Baker noted that flat funding at the federal level is expected and it is uncertain what impact that will have on state funding. It is anticipated there will be some issues in certain LWIAs with allocation process for WtW money, however this will not be an issue for Merced County, since all of the allocation was spent. WIA Reauthorization has gone through the House and it is anticipated it will be moving through the Senate (Senate passed its bill on 11/14/03). It is expect that the State will be requesting a position paper from all the California LWIAs in the next couple of weeks.

IX. Operational Reports

- a. Follow-Up Report – Regional Strategic Issues: Education – Lee Andersen addressed the WIB. He noted that more and continued communication and collaboration are needed;

informing the community about educational needs, strengths and possibilities is vital. In addition, he recommended development of countywide initiatives. He invited businesses to speak to school-to-career, sit on the ROP advisory committees, provide ROP worksites, support school districts, participate on school advisory committees, (ROP course approval contact Michelle Fagundes 381-6682) support school bonds, and volunteer at school activities such as the academic decathlon. These recommendations will be sent to the WIB members prior to the next meeting

- b. Idel Aire – speaker not available.

X. Action Agenda

- a. WIB/One-Stop Partner MOUs – It was M/S/C Bergman/Fowler to approve the amendments to the MOU between the WIB and the Worknet partners.

XI. Information Items

- a. Jobs for California Graduates Closeout Status – Andrea Baker provided an update on the status. She noted that the department is still working on getting documentation and final invoices in order to complete the close-out. It is anticipated that the contract with MCOE will be in front of the Board of Supervisors November 25, 2003 for approval. There was a question on how the services would be delivered. Ms. Holly Newlon addressed the question, it was noted that the funding would be shifted to provide more training and OJT to participants. Ms. Baker noted that there will be representatives from MCOE at the Executive Committee to provide an overview on the program.
- b. Small Planet Foods
- c. WIB Goal Assignment
- d. Fiscal Report
- e. LMI Updates
- f. Monitoring Report
- g. Director's Notes
- h. Farm Worker's Forum

XII. Spotlight on WIB Member – Tom Tsubota was not in attendance.

XIII. Director's Comments – Ms. Baker reported that she recently attended a meeting in San Francisco with WIB Chairs and Directors. It was decided at that meeting to hold a Workforce/Economic Development and Education meeting in Sacramento with legislators in January 2004. Ms. Baker also noted that the Youth Council recently received an award as mentioned in "Director's Notes." Lastly, Ms. Baker reported that Worknet magnetic signs are now being displayed on the local transit buses as part of the marketing efforts.

XIV. Chair Comments - Mr. Headding request input from WIB members on new topics for regional strategic issues.

XV. Other – None

XVI. Next Meeting – Jan 8, 2004

XVII. Adjourn – meeting adjourned 4:35.