

## **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The draft 2006-2007 Annual Plan was released for 30-day public comment ending on May 13, 2006. During this period the draft plan was discussed at WIB and Youth Council Committee meetings and at 3 public hearings. Public hearings were held on April 25, 2006 in Los Angeles and May 3, 2006 in Van Nuys. Another hearing was held as a regular portion of the Housing, Community and Economic Development Committee (HCED) meeting of the City Council on May 2, 2006. Additionally the plan was presented to Council deputies during a series of briefing sessions held to acquaint them with the plan.

The hearings were attended by members of community service organizations, members of the Youth Council, City and Employment Development Division (EDD) staff, WorkSource Center directors, Workforce Investment Board (WIB) members, and the public.

During each public hearing an overview of the draft plan was presented followed by a public comment session. A summary of public comments received from the three hearings is below. Some written comments have also been received and are attached.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following summarizes both written and verbal comments provided by major category:

#### **Performance Evaluation**

- Concern was expressed regarding performance evaluation; it was felt that the six under performing service providers should be placed on probation and receive additional technical assistance to allow for sufficient time to increase their performance.
- Concern was also expressed regarding the number of performance measures; it was recommended that the number be reduced and streamlined to the federal measures only. It was felt that having both federal and local measures placed unrealistic performance and contractual burdens on service providers.
- Concern was expressed about how performance is derived; it was felt that a center's cumulative performance from it's initial year of operation should be viewed for overall improvement annually as opposed to an evaluation of performance during a single annual period only.

**Budget/Resource Sharing/Leveraging of Resources**

- Concern was expressed regarding the federal requirement to form resource-sharing agreements with mandatory and non-mandatory partners. It was felt that limited resources negated the successful implementation of this requirement. It was also felt that this requirement could not be met without the assistance of the WIB.
- Concern was expressed that the WIB was unfamiliar with the efforts of service providers to leverage resources. It was felt that service providers have long since established valuable partnerships to leverage limited WIA resources. It was also felt that the system should undertake more joint efforts to leverage resources and submit system wide applications for grants and undertake other joint funding efforts to identify new resources. Partnerships have already been formed with LAUSD, the Community Colleges and businesses and employers.
- Concern was expressed that considerable effort and funds were expended on system infrastructure and that a reduction in the system would negate these. It was felt that the spread of budget cuts across system is a much better approach because it maintains system integrity. As such it was recommended the WIB adopt a policy to distribute/share future budget cuts across all stakeholders including the WIB, CDD and system providers. Also that low performing WorkSource Centers be provided increased technical assistance to develop and implement necessary corrective action plans.

**WorkSource System Review**

- Concern was expressed regarding the WorkSource System review. It was felt the review did not consider the effects of the reduction in services in some parts of the City. It was recommended the system be maintained as is with 18 WorkSource centers.
- Concern was expressed that a reduction in the WorkSource System may have negative effects on the Youth Opportunity System. Many system providers have established working partnerships and have even co-located their services for adults and youth. The reduction of the WorkSource system may hinder these relationships.
- Concern was expressed that the WIB was unfamiliar with the services provided to Universal Access customers. It was expressed that only a very few of these customers were able to access center services without assistance. It was also felt that failure to capture more data on the types of services provided to these customers was a disservice to the system.
- Concern was expressed that the service providers were not just WorkSource Centers but were major entities for service in the community. It was felt that the service providers were community experts who had built a rapport with many types of customers including the hardest to serve and youth.
- Concern was also expressed regarding the continuous quality improvement process. It was felt that service providers, the City and the WIB have expended considerable

**Public Comments**

efforts in implementing this process and as such the reduction of the WorkSource system would negate some past improvements. It was recommended that service providers be involved in developing solutions to system wide problems, including funding reductions as recommended by Malcolm Baldrige type improvement processes.

**Sector Initiatives**

- Concern was expressed that sector initiatives were conceptually not new initiatives but rather already being implemented by several service providers. It was reported that several service providers were already providing initiatives in the area of transportation, health care. As such it was recommended these initiatives be implemented through the current system.
- Concern was expressed that the implementation of sector initiatives must consider customers with many barriers to employment. It was felt that such initiatives should include disabled, youth and the poorly educated and that a tiered approach to these initiatives would be the most successful.

**Special Groups**

- Concern was expressed that services be provided the City's 22,000 public housing residents.
- Concern was expressed that, since transportation is the primary barrier to youth obtaining job related and education services, that to reduce the number of existing Centers might also reduce the access to job related services for low-income youth.

Attached are written statements provided to the City during the public comment period.