MONTEREY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

MEETING:	MARCH 18, 2003 – 11:00 A.M.	**AGENDA NO.:**
SUBJECT:	APPROVE RECOMMENDED RESPONSE TO THE 2002 MONTEREY COUNTY GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT (FILED JANUARY 2, 2003) AND AUTHORIZE STAFF OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE TO FILE APPROVED FINAL RESPONSE WITH THE PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA ON OR BEFORE APRIL 2, 2003	
DEPARTMENT:	COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors approve the proposed response to the 2002 Monterey County Grand Jury Final Report and authorize staff of the County Administrative Office to file the approved final response with the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California on or before April 2, 2003.

SUMMARY

The 2002 Grand Jury filed its annual report on January 2, 2003. By law, the Board of Supervisors has 90 days to file its response to findings and recommendations contained in the report.

DISCUSSION

The proposed response addresses each specific finding and recommendation directed to the Board of Supervisors. As in past years, much of the input in the proposed response results from comments received from departments mentioned in the Grand Jury Final Report. While the draft was intended to reflect staff understanding of Board policy, the Board had no direct input. The proposed report will not reflect actual Board policy until it has been reviewed, modified, and adopted by the Board during a public hearing.

The County Administrative Office and the involved Department Heads contributed to the preparation of the original proposal. The final responses of the Board should be deemed and accepted by the Grand Jury as the responses of the Monterey County Administrative Office and Monterey County's non-elected Department Heads.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

Members of the 2002 Grand Jury and appropriate Department Heads have been provided copies of the proposed Board of Supervisors' discussion of this matter. Members of the 2003 Grand Jury were also provided copies of the report.

FINANCING

Acceptance of the recommended Board response will have no direct financial impact on the General Fund.

Sally R. Reed RP

Sally R. Reed, County Administrative Officer
03/11/03

Report Prepared by: Bertha Gonzalez, CAO Analyst

Before the Board of Supervisors in and for the County of Monterey, State of California

Approve Recommended Response to the 2002 Monterey County Grand Jury Final Report, Filed January 2, 2003, and Authorize Staff of the County Administrative Office to File Approved Final Response With the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California On or Before April 2, 2003.....	))))))

Upon motion of Supervisor _____, seconded by Supervisor _____, and carried by those members present, the Board hereby approves the proposed response to the 2002 Monterey County Grand Jury Final Report and authorizes staff of the County Administrative Office to file the approved response with the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California on or before April 2, 2003.

PASSED AND ADOPTED on this 18th day of March, 2003, by the following vote, to-wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

I, Sally R. Reed, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey, State of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of an original order of said Board Supervisors duly made and entered in the minutes thereof at page ___ of Minute Book _____, on _____.

SALLY R. REED, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of Monterey, State of California.

Dated:_____

By_____
Deputy

IMPROVING THE COUNTY BUDGET PROCESS
Providing Better Tools for Management

FINDINGS

Programs & Projects

FINDING 1: The Recommended Budget provides goals and status of selected budget units, but a breakdown of costs for recommended or ongoing programs and projects is typically not shown.

RESPONSE: Agree.

The Board of Supervisors acknowledges the lack of cost data and the usefulness of such data for evaluating many programs included in the County Budget. The existing County Budget Preparation and Financial Information System does not aggregate data in such a manner as to permit the preparation of this type of information without substantial additional manual effort. The County Administrative Officer (CAO) and the County Auditor are exploring options for the replacement of the current obsolete financial systems.

The cost for replacing these systems is substantial and the timing of the replacement will depend on the County's financial situation and the weighing of this high priority need with other high priority needs.

FINDING 2: Personnel headcount and salaries are shown, but a more inclusive "fully loaded" cost of an individual is not estimated.

RESPONSE: Agree.

The Board of Supervisors notes the Recommended Budget does not include a discrete full costing for each position. Should this type of detailed information be available, the Board needs to consider how this information might be presented in a format that is concise yet still useful.

The Recommended Budget does endeavor to include the full salary and benefit costs for each new position for the number of months that position will be filled. Additionally these cost calculations for requested new positions are included in Board messages, which occur throughout the year. During the past few years it has been the Board's intent and policy to expand the "fully loaded cost" concept for these new positions to include any additional costs associated with adding a new position to include costs for such things as: vehicles, office space needs, furniture, mileage, tools, and any other costs which may be associated with the additional personnel. Direction to departments to include this information will be clarified in the published guidelines for budget preparation and for Board messages throughout the year.

FINDING 3: Expenditures are generally not identified by project or program (with exceptions).

RESPONSE: Agree.

This is partially true. Where possible the CAO will work with County departments in developing better program costing. The ease and timely implementation of this recommendation would be greatly aided by replacement of the County's obsolete financial, budget, and payroll systems.

Milestones, Efficiency & Effectiveness

FINDING 4: While new programs and projects within a budget entity are approved on their merit and priority, there appears to be no formal system in place to systematically ascertain and evaluate their actual performance and cost versus the milestones and goals when they were first adopted.

RESPONSE: Disagree.

The annual budget approval process, periodic program review, and program/issue review by the Board's Budget Committee provide a formal and systematic review of County programs. Department heads as program operators are closest to this information and are expected to assume responsibility for evaluating the success of new programs as well as the timely and regular reporting of this information to the Board's Budget Committee and to the full Board. The Board acknowledges that additional attention to this area is beneficial.

FINDING 5: Workloads and related statistics are frequently mentioned, but without measures of efficiency or effectiveness.

RESPONSE: Agree.

The Board of Supervisors concurs with this finding. Please see response to recommendations, below.

Terminating a Program

FINDING 6: Once established, a program may continue indefinitely, independent of its current relevance or effectiveness, as there is no simple way to identify these expenditures on an ongoing basis.

RESPONSE: Disagree.

Each County Department head is responsible for evaluating the success and need for each program under their area of responsibility. County Department heads are continually evaluating the way in which resources are expended in their respective areas of responsibility and making changes as needed. This is an area that merits the

need for continual attention, and the availability of program costing data would assist in the evaluation process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1: The 2002 Monterey County Civil Grand Jury recommends that an operational audit of the budget process be made (consider the use of the County Auditor or an independent consultancy) with the following goals in mind:

1. Improving clarity – i.e., making it simpler for people to see how the money is being spent and to visualize the impact of cutbacks.
2. Identifying performance measures – allowing the public to see whether the funds are being spent efficiently.

RESPONSE: The recommendation will be implemented.

The Board of Supervisors concurs in the need to make improvements in the clarity and in the connection between dollars spent or cut from each major program area. Improvement is a continual process. As part of the current budget preparation process for the FY 2003-04 Recommended Budget, county departments will be instructed to provide meaningful discussion as to the expected impact of program increases or reductions.

During the past year, staff from the CAO's office have been researching the "state of the art" in performance budgeting/management. This research has included site visits, telephone interviews, review of the literature, and evaluation of the efforts by others in developing effective and meaningful performance measures. The performance measures developed by other counties and cities range from very good "works in progress" to efforts which require considerable staff resources with questionable indices generated for the purpose of assessing performance. Those jurisdictions which have developed meaningful measures share the characteristics of having strong and continual executive and line department support and have committed significant staff to the effort of determining what are meaningful measures and the collection and evaluation of the results. The most successful efforts at performance measurement have been at the effort for several years and are continually improving their process.

The value of developing and implementing effective and meaningful measures of: "How good a job is County staff doing, and how effective are county administered programs?" is without question, valuable. Jurisdictions developing a formal system of performance measurement have approached this effort in different ways ranging from a "full blown roll out" requiring all departments to commit substantial resources to an approach involving a "pilot" program for

one or more departments. Both approaches have merit and logical argument supporting each approach.

Based on staff research, discussions with several departments, and consideration of available staff resources, the CAO has chosen the approach of piloting performance measurement efforts. At this time the County Health Department is working with staff of the Leadership Institute and their own departmental staff in developing a well thought out performance measurement program. Additional efforts have been taken or our being considered by the Natividad Medical Center and the Planning Department. Progress on these efforts will be reported in the 2003-04 Recommended County Budget.

The Grand Jury's recommendation that the Board consider the use of the County Auditor or an outside consultancy is an excellent one. The County Auditor's staff is well versed in many of the technical aspects of costing and can provide an assessment of performance, which is independent of daily program operations. The Auditor's office, through their internal audit staff, has been of considerable assistance in reviewing departmental operations. Their assistance will be requested in our development of meaningful performance measures. Several consultancies specialize in measuring performance and have assisted other governmental agencies in their program development. The use and value of contracting with this type of expertise will be considered as we move ahead.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE MID-YEAR FINAL REPORT ON AVAILABILITY OF WATER ON THE MONTEREY PENINSULA

The Role of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

FINDINGS

FINDING 6: The results of the voting on Measure B indicate the desire of the majority of voters within the MPWMD to abolish the water district. The advisory vote on the question "Should the MPWMD be dissolved" was 66.5% in favor and 33.5% opposed.

RESPONSE: Agree.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1: The November 2002 advisory vote of the affected residents should be taken as a mandate and the existence of the MPWMD be terminated by proper political process. That the cities and County mount a joint effort to have their state legislators sponsor a bill in the legislature to dissolve the MPWMD, and

RESPONSE: The recommendation has been implemented.

State Senator Bruce McPherson has introduced spot legislation, with the intent to explore options for governance of the MPWMD and the water resources of the Carmel River Watershed.

RECOMMENDATION 2a: No new agency, leaving Cal Am to operate as it does in most other areas, under the aegis of the existing state agencies; or

RESPONSE: See response to Recommendation #1, above.

RECOMMENDATION 2b: A joint powers agency with a board of directors comprised of appointees from those same cities and the County.

RESPONSE: See response to Recommendation #1, above.

FINDINGS

FINDING 1: The Monterey County Office of Emergency Services provides an acceptable level of support and coordination to meet emergencies within the County. Although possible, a major terrorism incident is not anticipated, but if one should occur, the County could expect a rapid on-scene response from state and federal authorities.

RESPONSE: Agree.

FINDING 2: The state of preparedness of the County to handle an emergency situation would be improved if all the responsible agencies participated in each and every emergency exercise in the same manner as they would in an actual emergency.

RESPONSE: Agree.

We recognize that each Agency has competing needs and we appreciates the level of participation that does occur.

FINDING 3: The Monterey County Office of Emergency Services would be more effective if it reported directly to the CAO as a staff function. County Code section 2.68.050 specifies the CAO as the ex-officio Director of the OES, thus implying a direct reporting relationship. There is no provision for a level of administrative supervision between the CAO-Director and the Deputy Director of the OES.

RESPONSE: Disagree.

The CAO's role in an emergency, as specified by the County Code, is different from what is required in the day-to-day operations of the Office of Emergency Services. Furthermore, most of the OES staff time is spent in planning for future events and coordinating with multiple agencies. Both of these functions are very similar to functions performed by other staff that reports to the Chief Assistant CAO.

FINDING 4: The 1,000 hours of unpaid overtime put in by the professional staff of the OES in order to provide an acceptable level of service is excessive. The fact that the backlog of work is growing, even with this level of overtime, is again indicative of a shortage of staff.

RESPONSE: Partially disagree.

While the unpaid overtime is excessive, it is not unique given the County's current fiscal position. Many other functions rely on unpaid overtime my management staff in order to function effectively.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1: For both operations and administration, the Office of Emergency Services through its head, the Deputy Director, report directly to its ex-Officio Director who is the County Administrative Officer.

RESPONSE: The recommendation will not be implemented.

While the CAO is actively involved in case of an emergency, the position should report to the Assistant CAO on the day-to-day operations.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The staffing level of the Office of Emergency Services be increased by two additional planners and that staffing be reviewed annually for the possible addition of a third planner.

RESPONSE: The recommendation will not be implemented because the County has many competing needs for staff resources. The current workload will need to be prioritized to maintain public safety, while reducing the number of staff hours.

FINDINGS

FINDING 1: Fluoridation of drinking water will provide a positive health benefit to the citizens of the County with the greatest benefit accruing to the most disadvantaged citizens.

RESPONSE: Agree.

The scientific evidence available, and the experience of the thousands of communities across the country that are provided optimally fluoridated water, supports the conclusion that fluoridation of local drinking water will provide positive health benefits to residents of Monterey County, particularly those who lack routine access to preventive dental services.

FINDING 2: With the possible exception of smaller water systems, start-up and operations costs of drinking water fluoridation are more than offset by cost avoidance in the areas of dental and general health care.

RESPONSE: Agree.

California taxpayers bear the financial burden of almost $700 million a year in Denti-Cal costs. The annual cost to individuals, families and employers associated with the treatment of preventable dental disease, particularly caries, and dental insurance, exceed the cost of the routine fluoridation of community drinking water. The per household cost associated with implementing optimally fluoridated drinking water through either of the County's two largest providers of drinking water is estimated to be about $50, far less than the cost of filling a single cavity. The per person cost to maintain this level of fluoridation ranges from $2-$12 a year.

FINDING 3: There are a multitude of water providers and jurisdictions within the County, and there is no coordinated advocacy program joining political leadership and health professions to implement fluoridation of drinking water.

RESPONSE: Agree.

There is currently no coordinated advocacy effort, involving political leadership and health professionals, to implement fluoridation of drinking water.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1: The County of Monterey become a principal advocate for fluoridation of drinking water in the County, and provide leadership to water providers and users in unincorporated areas to obtain needed start-up funding and user rate increases to support ongoing operations for fluoridation.

RESPONSE: The recommendation has not yet been implemented.

Although such a decision will be controversial, it is considered appropriate that the County of Monterey, through the Health Department, take a leadership role in advocating for the fluoridation of drinking water and working with water providers, health professionals, and the general public to seek support and funding for the fluoridation of drinking water.

FINDINGS

FINDING 1: Juvenile Hall facilities were generally clean and neat, but due to the advanced age of buildings, there is a backlog of needed maintenance and safety corrections, which are seriously under funded.

RESPONSE: Agree.

FINDING 2: There is a lack of visual screening between Juvenile Hall and the County Jail.

RESPONSE: Agree.

FINDING 3: Juvenile Hall does not provide the level of security required to house today's most violent youthful offenders.

RESPONSE: Agree.

FINDING 4: Classroom space at Juvenile Hall is inadequate to comply with State education requirements.

RESPONSE: Agree.

FINDING 5: Rancho Natividad will give at-risk youths a greater opportunity to become employable and productive citizens.

RESPONSE: Agree.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1: For protection of the surrounding community and safety of the youth housed in Juvenile Hall, Unit "A" be "hardened" to conform to current standards for maximum security incarceration.

RESPONSE: The recommendation requires further analysis.

Prior to January 2003, the Probation Department had been recommending the hardening of "A" Unit to current standards for maximum-security incarceration. However, due to the recent structural damage to the entire Juvenile Hall and the closing of "A" Unit, it is felt that the recommendation should be temporarily delayed until the County develops a comprehensive plan for the entire Juvenile Hall.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Adequate screening be installed between Juvenile Hall and the County Jail so as to remove all possibility of contact between the two populations.

RESPONSE: The recommendation requires further analysis.

When the new Juvenile Hall's recreation yard fence was built in summer of 2002, the Probation Department had recommended that a block wall be installed to isolate Juvenile Hall from the County Jail. Due to funding limitation, the County installed a wire fence. It is recommended that the new fence be upgraded with wooden slats, to block view and communication between jail inmates and Juvenile Hall wards.

RECOMMENDATION 3: The BOS allocate adequate funds to address the deficiencies identified in Juvenile Hall as outlined in the Fire/Life Safety report and subsequently "referred to Facilities."

RESPONSE: The recommendation requires further analysis.

The Board concurs and supports Grand Jury recommendation #3. However, the Board of Supervisors can only determine the merits of the recommendation in the context of the County's overall budget. An analysis of the facility needs is underway.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Planning for a new Juvenile Hall be started in 2003.

RESPONSE: The recommendation requires further analysis.

The Board and the Probation Department support the need for a new Juvenile Hall. The Grand Jury recommendation was made based on the long-term deterioration of Juvenile Hall, and prior to the discovery of significant new damage. Due to this discovery, an analysis of the facility needs is underway.

RECOMMENDATION 5: The BOS allocate sufficient funds to facilitate an early and orderly transfer of programs currently at the Youth Center to Rancho Natividad, and to expand the programs at the new space.

RESPONSE: The recommendation requires further analysis.

The Probation Department is working under the assumption that the Grand Jury was referring to the Silver Star Youth Program (a.k.a. Rancho Natividad Youth Complex), not the Youth Center. If so, the Board of Supervisors, through the Probation Department, strongly concurs with the recommendation.

The Silver Star Youth Program is scheduled to move to the former Boys Ranch site (Rancho Natividad Youth Complex). The program has been proven to be an outstanding comprehensive treatment program, and very cost effective, by saving Monterey County substantial detention, placement and CYA costs.

During this time of slow economy and limited availability of funds, the expansion of the complex, which is based on the collaboration between the public and private sector, has slowed. It is believed any help the County could provide would benefit both the minors in the community, and be a sound fiscal decision, by generating significant savings in detention and placement costs.

FINDINGS

FINDING 1: Conflicting interests arise as a result of the common management of the Workforce Investment Board (WIB) and the Office for Employment Training (OET).

RESPONSE: Partially Disagree.

The executive management of the WIB has a comprehensive job description that delineates the roles and responsibilities in working with the Board of Supervisors, the WIB and other federal, state and local entities. In the fourteen samples of duties listed, thirteen definitely have no conflicting interests. The second duty listed requires the coordination and direction, through subordinate managers, of "the activities of the employment programs...of the Office for Employment Training". In this instance, although no conflict has existed, the structure of the job duties could cause a potential concern in the future.

FINDING 2: The WIB has no independent supporting staff. Support services are provided by employees of the OET which itself is a provider of youth services.

RESPONSE: Agree.

The staffing of the WIB by executive management who is responsible to their County or City Executives is typical and allowable under the Act regulations. Throughout California's fifty Workforce Investment Areas, more than 80% have adopted this model. In reviewing the job description of executive management, very little of the actual job duties focus on direct operations. The Employment Programs Administrator who heads the Program Operations Division for youth and adults has generally been responsible for the daily operation of the Office for Employment and Training through its MOU with the Workforce Investment Board.

FINDING 3: Core and summer programs provided by the OET do not require competitive bidding; however, funds available to the WIB from federal grants for youth training programs are not being allocated to service providers on the basis of competitive bids as required by Act regulations.

RESPONSE: Partially disagree.

The Youth Council, Executive Committee and the WIB approve summer programs and their activities. The core services being provided include outreach, recruitment, eligibility, assessment, job matching, job placement, counseling, supportive services, and paid and unpaid work experience through a structured MOU with the WIB. Services that should be bid include certified vocational or educational training and

follow-up. Solicitation for additional service providers that can build a bigger, more comprehensive system has been the goal of the WIB and its subcommittees.

On September 25, 2002 the Planning Committee discussed coordinating with the Chair of the Youth Council to agendize the development of proposals to increase youth services. On November 12, 2002 the Youth Council approved the development of an RFP for Title I WIA youth funds. On November 18, 2002 the Executive Committee approved the development and solicitation of the RFP, with full concurrence of the WIB on January 21, 2003. The proposal has been developed and was released on March 3, 2003. Proposals are due April 11, 2003. Additional solicitations are currently being considered by staff for presentation to the WIB.

In a March 6, 2003 white paper submitted by the U.S. Department of Labor on the reauthorization of WIA, there is considerable discussion regarding the structure, design and intent of youth programs. The summer jobs component may be modified or eliminated. Service to in-school youth may be eliminated. The redesign of services for older out-of-school youth may be intensified. These proposals and recommendations are currently being formulated. It is anticipated that by June 30, 2003, services, program delivery strategies and new allocations of resource levels will be more defined.

FINDING 4: WIB meetings are dominated by the executive staff, including procedure, content, and direction. The WIB and its President are not exercising independent control.

RESPONSE: Disagree.

The members of the WIB, consultants and staff developed the WIA five-year plan and the bylaws. Agendas for WIB and subcommittee meetings are developed collaboratively with the Chair or the heads of subcommittees respectively. The Chair or heads of the subcommittees call upon staff to make presentations or clarify action items as deemed necessary. Between June 29, 2000 and February 4, 2003, the WIB or its subcommittees met seventy-five times. These meetings have generated thirty-three reports that have gone to the County Board of Supervisors for concurrence of proposed WIB actions.

The WIB members monitor, as unpaid volunteers, all funded programs and the One-Stop Career Center System. WIB members have attended conferences and retreats, and have received training on conflict of interest, legislation and regulations, vision and goal setting, creating win-win situations, and leadership strategy. The WIB has developed its top twelve priorities for workforce development, approved Memorandums of Understanding for the fifteen partner agencies, and set policies on Individual Training Accounts, Supportive Services and Eligible Training Provider Lists.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1: The BOS re-examine its approval of the Monterey County Strategic Five-Year Local Workforce Investment Plan granted on February 22, 2000, for the Monterey County Workforce Investment Board.

RESPONSE: The recommendation will be implemented no later than August 30, 2003.

RECOMMENDATION 1a: Immediately divide the OET into two organizations independent of one another (not one subservient to the other) – one organization being the staff of the WIB, and the other organization (the "new OET") functioning as a service provider, with a separate executive staff for each organization.

RESPONSE: The recommendation will be implemented no later than July 2003.

Effective March 3, 2003, a temporary special assignment of OET Deputy Director has been established. The OET Deputy Director is charged with planning, organizing, managing and administering the OET for the County of Monterey. Responsibilities include the direct and indirect supervision of the OET Fiscal, Management Information Systems (MIS), Human Resources and Employment Programs staff. This individual reports directly to the Assistant County Administrative Officer and is not subservient to the WIB Executive Director. The WIB Executive Director also reports directly to the Assistant County Administrative Officer and is charged with providing staff support to the WIB. This move begins to recognize these two organizations as separate entities with separate executive staff as recommended by the Grand Jury. A consultant is currently working on further defining the organizational and staffing needs of these two entities and the work should be concluded and implemented no later than July 2003.

RECOMMENDATION 1b: Designate the WIB and its staff to serve as the grant recipient and procure and oversee programs.

RESPONSE: The recommendation has been implemented.

The WIB and its executive management serve as the grant recipient and procure and oversee programs.

RECOMMENDATION 1c: Specify that the "new OET" as a potential provider of youth services (among other programs) function as any other provider/partner, to operate the programs for which it has successfully competed.

RESPONSE: The recommendation requires further analysis.

Currently, OET anticipates the implementation of year-round core services and summer jobs projects. OET is not intending to be a lead agency submitting proposals for funds the WIB expects to subcontract for youth services for the solicitation that closes on April 11, 2003. OET may be asked, however, by lead agencies wishing to collaborate to build bigger and stronger systems, to be a part of their application

as a subcontractor. As of this date, no requests have been received. Collaborative relationships could leverage the existing services offered through the One Stop Career Center System. Finally, the reauthorization of WIA legislation is pending, and the roles of One Stop Career Centers and service providers are being reviewed and redefined.

RECOMMENDATION 1d: Mandate that all Board and OET procurements including contracts are to be processed through the Monterey County General Services Department to ensure that the Department of Labor competitive procurement principles and procedures found in the Training and Employment Guidance Letter 9-00 are followed.

RESPONSE: The recommendation has been implemented.

Currently, General Services and County Counsel have participated in the development and solicitation of the adult and youth RFP proposals. All other procurements are going through General Services.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The County Counsel assign a deputy to attend all WIB meetings to ensure compliance with state and federal laws and regulations and to advise the WIB and its staff on any and all legal matters.

RESPONSE: The recommendation has been implemented.

Effective as of February 25, 2003, a Deputy County Counsel has been assigned to attend and has begun attending all Workforce Investment Board (WIB) meetings.

RECOMMENDATION 3: The members of the WIB and its Youth Council be instructed, by appropriate experts, as to their roles and responsibilities under the Act and the rules imposed upon the WIB by governmental regulations.

RESPONSE: The recommendation has been implemented, and will continue as part of the second WIB retreat scheduled for April 30th and May 1st.

Staff and consultants, in a continuing education process, will develop numerous presentations to the WIB and all subcommittees. Suggested topics that the WIB is currently considering for the retreat are as follows:

- Review of the By-Laws (this will include board structures and meeting schedules)
- Review of the Brown Act, conflict of interest, and meeting protocol
- WIA legislation refresher and update on reauthorization plans
- Development of Business Services
- Development and expansion of the youth employment system

- Grant writing and fund raising
- Local WIB involvement in the development of broader collaborations on county, state and national workforce development issues
- Establishing and maintaining mission, vision and objectivity
- Evaluation and improvement of collaborative partnerships through the One-Stops
- Services to Dislocated Workers, Disadvantaged Adults, Incumbent Workers: evaluation, focus, priorities
- Marketing One-Stop services: evaluation, priorities.

In the current proposal submitted for WIA reauthorization by the U.S. Department of Labor, they are suggesting that the decision to continue to develop, fund or staff Youth Councils be a local option. This and other reauthorization issues are currently being studied at the congressional level.

RECOMMENDATION 4: The Executive Director of the WIB provide both the WIB and the BOS a detailed annual report of all programs, and the participants' profiles and performance results.

RESPONSE: The recommendation will be implemented.

A presentation to the WIB and BOS for program year 2001-02 will be presented no later than August 2003 and a report for program year 2002-2003 will be presented to the WIB and the BOS by December 2003. Included will be the achievement of performance standards mandated by the U.S. Department of Labor and participant profiles.

RECOMMENDATION 5: The WIB adopt a set of guidelines to ensure properly functioning board meetings.

RESPONSE: The recommendation will be implemented.

As part of the April 30th and May 1st WIB Retreat, the WIB will develop guidelines for Workforce Investment Board meetings.