

## TEGL 04-95 ATTACHMENT F

### PY 1996 WAGNER-PEYSER PLANNING GUIDANCE

1. Building America's One-Stop Systems. During PY 1996, one of the Employment and Training Administration's (ETA) high priority goals will be to work with State Employment Security Agencies (SESAs) to integrate labor exchange activities into States' One-Stop Career Center systems.

Beginning in October 1994, States received ETA funds to plan and implement One-Stop systems. In many States, labor exchange programs serve as the platform and core institution for establishing One-Stop Career Center systems. The ES Revitalization initiative has been a major contributor in preparing labor exchange and other workforce development activities based in the Employment Service to play a key role in the emerging One-stop Career development system.

The ES Revitalization initiative's emphasis on a strong customer service focus in improving state labor exchange and related programs will continue to enhance SESAs' ability to meet the needs of employers and job seekers in a One-Stop Career Center system. In PY 1996, Wagner-Pesyer policy at the federal level will continue to promote a federal-state partnership that delivers job finding and employers services through a customer-focused, technology-advanced, increasingly self-serviced and outcome-driven system.

2. Labor Exchange Initiatives. Job seekers and employers rely on ETA and State partners to provide better job opportunities for American workers and higher productivity for employers through a broad range of services that increase the efficiency with which the U.S. labor market operates.

States are encouraged to use Wagner-Peyser funds to cooperate and assist the Federal partner in implementing these goals through the following initiatives:

- a. Building an electronic labor exchange network through:
  - o America's Job Bank/State Job Bank Internet linkages;
  - o Employers' direct job order entry on Internet;
  - o Talent Bank on Internet;
- b. Continue building the capacity of state labor exchange staff and services to play a key system-building role in the One-Stop systems through products and

services created by cooperative agreements. These products and services are designed to have system-wide application.

- o Customer satisfaction tools and training (Rhode Island)
- o Capacity Building (Iowa)
- o Workforce ATM (West Virginia)
- o Leadership Exchange (Texas)
- o Resource Center Design (Maryland)
- o Automated Job Matching (Ohio)
- o Performance measurements focusing attention on increasing job vacancies and reducing the duration of job seeker unemployment. (Washington)

c. Cooperate with ETA and National Employer Council (NEC) efforts to provide for employer input into the operation of the emerging One-stop Career Center system. The ETA/NEC efforts are designed to expand employer involvement in the State Employment Security system.

d. Conduct effective employer contact programs to improve customer service, to increase the number of job orders received, and to identify ways to reduce the transition time of unemployed workers from unemployment to reemployment.

3. Services to Unemployment Insurance (UI) Claimants. The relationship between the labor exchange and UI programs is long-standing and rooted in their respective legislative evolution and their common financing structure. Moreover, State labor exchange programs provide indispensable help to America's UI claimants who are seeking reemployment services and job leads to reenter the labor market. State plans should indicate how States will achieve high standards of customer service and satisfaction for UI claimants. In particular, State labor exchange programs should:

a. Seek methods to improve their technological capacity to meet the work test and feedback requirements of the State UI system, and seek improved methods to reduce the job search transition time of cyclical and structural (dislocated) unemployed workers.

b. Enhance the scope and depth of reemployment services to UI claimants. Implementation of a Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services (WPRS) system for UI claimants is a key step in building One-Stop systems. Assisting States in implementing the WPRS system is a major priority of the U.S. Employment Service. State planning should include specific steps to accomplish the implementation of the WPRS system. Regional staff responsible for working with ES agencies should be participating, as appropriate, in the regional integrated WPRS assistance team(s) activities, including comprehensive oversight of State WPRS implementation.

4. Services to Veterans. State ES systems continue to function as the primary source of labor exchange and support activities for our nation's veterans. As states develop their One-Stop Career Center systems, it is important that veterans, particularly disabled veterans, continue to be served in accordance with the applicable provisions of 38 U.S.C. Chapters 41 and 42.

In planning State activities in support of veterans, it is important that States give serious consideration to the following recommendations made by the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Veterans' Employment and Training (ACVET) in their 1995 Annual Report. Both recommendations are geared to the identification of veterans, so that appropriate services can be provided. Particular emphasis is placed on increasing the awareness that many women are veterans.

"The Secretary of Labor add the message 'Are you a man or a woman who has served in the military' at all kiosks and other self service employment centers."

"Encourage state employment service offices to post a highly visible sign in waiting areas asking clients to identify themselves as veterans (both male and female), if appropriate."

A copy of the full ACVET Report is available from the State Director for Veterans' Employment and Training.

5. Services to Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers (MSFW). Planning requirements for MSFW activity should be undertaken in accord with regulations at 20 CFR Part 653, Subpart B. The Indicators of Compliance have been updated where appropriate and ETA determination of significant states, significant and bilingual local offices, etc. are hereby incorporated and provided with Attachment II.

A key element for States' PY 1996 Wagner-Peyser plan is preparing for the transition of MSFW services -- including Monitor Advocate services -- into States' One-Stop Career Center systems. In preparing their plans, States should consider how the major functions of the Monitor Advocate program -- the role of the State Monitor Advocate, outreach workers, the complaint system and reporting -- would be transitioned into the One-stop Career Center system.

The plan should also indicate how the State will achieve high standards of customer service and satisfaction for MSFW customers in a One-Stop environment, and what approaches to measuring quality of service and customer satisfaction will be used.

6. Inquiries. Direct questions to relating to your Regional Office

7. Attachments.

II Agricultural Services Planning Guidance (PY 1996 Currently being revised. PY 1995 included for informational purposes)

## ATTACHMENT I

### GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF ES STATE PLAN

la. State Agency Plan Checklist. Regional Offices should use the checklist (la) to insure that the plan complies with the Wagner-Peyser Act. State plans are required to be developed in accordance with the processes established by the State under 20 CFR 652.4(a).

The RA may review and approve the State Agency plan without consulting the National Office, except for States which have an ES component plan in dispute, or where a modification to the State Agency plan has been proffered. An ETA executive group will review RA recommendations on these matters. To facilitate that review, Regions should provide the National Office (Attention: TGRP) information and materials specified in Attachments Ib and Ic. Advance notification of anticipated problems will speed the review process.

Ib. Component Plan in Dispute/Not Certified. The State Agency plan must be certified by the SJTCC/HRIC to be approvable. However, the State plan may include component plans not certified by the SJTCC/HRIC, on which the State agency, PIC, and chief elected officials have failed to reach agreement. If an ES component plan in dispute is sent with the State Agency plan, the Regional Office should use that portion of the Checklist which applies to disputed component plans. Also, for each ES component plan in dispute, Regions should use the format in Attachment Ib to prepare a special summary of issues involved, a profile of views, and recommendations of various parties, i.e., Governor, SJTCC/HRIC, State agency, and PIC/CEO, and an RA recommendation. The latter recommendation should be made in the context of any special planning instructions issued by the State for Wagner-Peyser implementation, and the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan and statement of goals and objectives issued in connection with JTPA.

Ic. Proposed Modification. If the Governor sends a proposed modification with the State Agency plan, Regional Offices should prepare a summary of the proposal and an RA recommendation using the format in Attachment Ic. The latter recommendation should be made in the same context as specified above for ES component plans in dispute.

Id. Plan Disapproval. The National Office also will review cases for which the RA recommends disapproval of the State Agency plan, for reasons other than those set forth in Ib or Ic. Using format Id, Regional staff should prepare a summary of State plan deficiencies that preclude the plan from complying with the amended Wagner-Peyser Act. Regions should provide this information to the National Office (Attention: TGRP).

If the State Agency plan or modification is disapproved due to either Ib, c, or d, the National Office will send the letter of disapproval and specify

actions necessary for the State Agency to take in submitting a revised plan. The State Agency will have 30 days to revise its plan.

le. Plan Approval. After the RA reviews and approves/disapproves the State Agency plan, the RA should send a letter similar to that suggested in Attachment 1e to the Governor, State Agency, and SJTCC/HRIC chairperson. Approval letters for State Agency plans with component plans in dispute and/or a proposed modification by the Governor will be sent by the National Office.

**Attachment Ia**

STATE AGENCY PLAN CHECKLIST

State: \_\_\_\_\_ State Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Received: \_\_\_\_\_ Review Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_

State plans are required to be developed in accordance with the processes established by the State under 20 CFR 652.4(a). Regional Offices should make a determination that the State met these requirements. To do this, obtain documentation that will verify the existence of public notice of substate distributions and the process and procedures used for resource distribution.

A.	STATE PLAN CONTENT	YES	NO	REMARKS
1	Is there evidence that the State, including single SDA States, made public the resource distributions within 30 days of receipt of final planning estimates and fully complied with requirements in 20 CFR 652.4(a)?			
2	Was the State Agency plan sent to the RA through the Governor or designee?			
3	Is there documentation that the SJTCC certified the State Agency plan describing activities under both Section 7 (a), (b) and (c)?			
4	Is there documentation that the Governor had the opportunity to review and comment on the State Agency plan? (Or was the delegation to the SESA all inclusive?)			
5	Did the Governor propose any modification to the State Agency plan? (If yes, Regional Office staff are to prepare an analysis of the matter using the format in Attachment Ic)			

A.	STATE PLAN CONTENT	YES	NO	REMARKS
6	Has the SJTCC/HRIC certified all the component plans and the State plan? (If not, identify the plans yet to be certified and complete the analysis required in Attachment Ib.)			
7	Does the State Agency plan include distinctive descriptions for all "Basic Program" elements, i.e., requirements of Section 8 (d) of the Act as well as 20 CFR 652.6(a) (4)?			
8	Has a plan been submitted describing the use of 10 percent funds under Section 7[b] of the Act and the use of funds under Section 7(c)?			
9	Does the State Agency plan conform to one or more of the three distinctive categories in Section 7(b) of the Act?			
10	Does the plan include how labor exchange activities will be incorporated in the development of the State's One-Stop Career Center systems?			
11	Does the plan include how the State intends to build its electronic labor exchange network:			
	a. America's Job Bank/State Job Bank Internet linkages.			
	b. Employers' direct job order entry on the Internet.			
	c. Talent Bank on the Internet.			
12	Are Services to Unemployment Insurance (UI) Claimants incorporated in the State Plans?			
	a. Methods to improve their technological capacity to meet the work test and feedback requirements			

A.	STATE PLAN CONTENT	YES	NO	REMARKS
	b. Methods to enhance the scope and depth of reemployment services to UI claimants through the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services initiative.			
13	Has the RAVT review identified compliance issues with regard to service to veterans?			
14	Does the State plan provide an overall description of the activities planned for providing services to the agricultural community? Does it specifically describe or include the following sections/items?			
	a. Assessment of need			
	b. Outreach plan			
	c. Services provided to MSFWs			
	d. Service provided to agricultural employers			
	e. Integrate services into States' One-Stop Career Center systems			
	f. Monitor Advocate approval or comments			
	g. Affirmative Action Plans (for designated offices)			
	h. Evidence that JTPA 402 grantees, advocacy groups, agricultural organizations/ employers and others were given the opportunity to comment on the State plan for Agricultural Services and local office Affirmative Action Plans (copies of correspondence and agency responses may be included in the plan or sent to Regional Office separately with the plan)			
15	Is the MSFW portion of the plan consistent with Attachment II?			

A.	STATE PLAN CONTENT	YES	NO	REMARKS
16	Is the grantee's workplace covered by an annual Drug-Free Workplace Certification as required by 29 CFR Part 98?			
17	Has the grantee submitted an annual certification regarding lobbying as required by 29 CFR Part 93?			
B.	ES COMPONENT PLANS IN DISPUTE			
1	If the State Agency plan includes any ES component plans in dispute, was documentation provided on views and recommendations of all interested parties (Governor, SJTCC/HRIC, State Agency, and PIC/CEO) as required under 20 CFR 652.6(b)?			
2	For each ES component plan in dispute have Regional Office staff prepared an analysis of the matter using the format in Attachment Ib?			

Date Submitted to National Office \_\_\_\_\_

Review National Office

- a. Proposed modification to State Agency plan.
- b. RA recommends State Agency plan disapproval.
- c. ES component plans in dispute.

C. PLAN APPROVAL

Regional Office Approval of State Agency plan.  
(Not to be completed until National Office review is completed, if applicable.)

---

(RA Signature and Date)

Determination Letters Sent  
(See Attachment Ie)

Governor_____	Date_____
SJTCC/HRIC_____	Date_____
State Agency_____	Date_____

Attachment Ib

ANALYSIS OF AN ES COMPONENT PLAN IN DISPUTE  
ANALYSIS OF STATE PLAN NOT CERTIFIED BY SJTCC/HRIC

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

State: \_\_\_\_\_

SDA (If applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

I. Summary of Key Issues in Dispute:

II. Profile of Views and Recommendations of Various Parties (Governors, SJTCC/HRIC, State Agency, and PIC/CEO)

III. In what way, if at all, do each of the proposed alternative component plans impact on the overall State Plan? (For example, if an SDA wants more resources, have they dealt with the issue of where the funds would come from? --Applies to component plans in dispute.)

IV. Would approval of any of the alternative component plans (or of the State plan not certified) prevent the State Agency from meeting the basic labor exchange requirements?

V. RA Recommendation

Concurrence \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Nonconcurrence \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACH REPRODUCED COPIES OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS

Attachment Ic

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO STATE AGENCY PLAN

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

State: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed by: \_\_\_\_\_

I. Nature of Proposed Modification

II. Is State plan submitted by designated agency and/or proposed modification in compliance with the Act and regulations? If not, explain.

III. RA Recommendation

Concurrence \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Nonconcurrence \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACH REPRODUCED COPIES OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS

STATE PLAN FOR AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

State Plan Requirements. Each State agency, in its State Plan, shall describe the activities planned for servicing its agricultural community of employers and the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers (MSFWs). Section I through IV, and the corresponding Tables in Section V, of this Attachment comprise the critical components required of this State plan by Federal Regulations at 20 CFR Part 653. Said regulations further require several statements of assurances which are intended to facilitate and ensure the participation of the MSFW advocacy and service community, as well as the State's obligation to program oversight and monitoring. The following assurances shall be submitted with the State Plan for Agricultural Services:

1. State Monitor Advocate Approval/Comments.

All States are to provide a statement that the State Monitor Advocate prepared or participated in the preparation of the agricultural plan and has been afforded the opportunity to approve and/or comment on said plan.

2. Consideration of Previous Year's Annual Monitor Advocate Report.

All States are to provide a statement indicating that consideration was given to the State Monitor Advocate's recommendations as presented in the annual MSFW summary developed under 20 CFR 653.108(t), in the preparation of this plan.

3. Affirmative Action Plan Review/Comments.

States with designated Significant Affirmative Action Local Offices are required to submit an Affirmative Action Plan in accordance with 20 CFR 653.111. All States are to provide a statement indicating that, as per 20 CFR 653.111(4)(h), the State Monitor Advocate has been afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the State's Affirmative Action Plan, which is to be submitted as part of the State plan.

4. Review and comment by JTPA, Section 402 grantees.

All States are to provide information indicating that Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), Section 402 grantees, other appropriate MSFW groups, public agencies, agricultural employer organizations and other interested employer organizations, have been given the opportunity to comment on the State Agricultural Services Plan, including any required significant MSFW local office affirmative action plans. A list of organizations from whom information and suggestions for the plans were solicited, any comments received on the proposed plans and agency responses are to be submitted with the State's plan.

I. Assessment of need.

All States shall prepare a comprehensive assessment of need plan in accordance with Federal requirements at 20 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 653. This assessment of need shall be based on SESA data and agricultural activities and shall also take into account data supplied by JTPA 402 grantees, MSFW organizations, employer organizations, and Federal, State and local government agencies including Migrant Education, the Departments of Agricultural and Health/Human Services, etc. This assessment of need shall include:

A. A review of the agricultural crop activity in the State, for the previous program year, indicating:

- 6 each major MSFW labor intensive crop activity;
- 6 the months of activity for each crop;
- 6 the geographic area of each crop activity; and
- 6 crops which experienced labor shortages.

B. A review of the MSFW labor force activity in the State, to include an estimate of:

- 6 the agricultural labor employed in each of the crops identified in item I.A; and
- 6 the number of MSFWs involved in each crop.

C. For Program year 1996, indicate the:

- 6 projected level of agricultural crop activity; and
- 6 expected changes from crop activities as described in item I.A.

D. For Program year 1996, indicate the:

- 6 projected MSFW labor force activity (number of workers, shortages/surpluses) in the State; and
- 6 any expected changes in MSFW labor force activity by crop.

II. Outreach Plan.

All States shall prepare a comprehensive outreach plan in accordance with requirements at 20 CFR Part 653. The Outreach Plan must be based on the actual conditions which exist in the particular State, taking into account the State agency's history of providing outreach services, the estimated number of MSFWs in the State. The plan must be responsive to the State's assessment of need for outreach services as demonstrated in Item I above.

The five States with the highest estimated year-round MSFW activities must assign full-time year-round staff to outreach activities. These States are designated each year by the Employment and Training Administration (ETA). The designations for PY 1996 are as listed in Table IV.5. The remainder of the significant MSFW States must make maximum efforts to hire outreach staff with MSFW experience for year-round positions and shall assign outreach staff to work full-time during the period of highest activity.

Approval by the Regional Administrator will be based on the Plan's responsiveness to State need for outreach services and must also include the following criteria:

A. Assessment of Available Resources. This assessment of the resources available for outreach shall include:

1. The number of State Agency staff positions to be assigned to outreach activities. Indicate the full-time equivalent positions for each local office to which staff are to be assigned, and the number of staff assigned to the State office for this purpose. Designated significant local offices shall assign full-time staff for outreach activities during the peak seasons.

2. Where the number of State Agency staff positions assigned to outreach activities is less than in the prior year, please explain the reason for the reduction, and the expected effect of the reduction on direct outreach activities.

3. Resources to be made available through existing cooperative agreements with public and private community service agencies and MSFW groups. (States are encouraged to initiate cooperative agreements with 402 grantees for outreach positions).

B. Numerical Goals. The following numerical goals should reflect expected outcomes from outreach efforts described in Item II.A:

1. The number of MSFWs to be contacted during the program year by ES staff, listed by local office where outreach staff is assigned, as well as State office.

2. The number of staff days (based on 8 hour days) to be utilized for outreach, listed by local office where outreach staff is assigned, as well as the State office.

3. The number of MSFWs planned to be contacted by other agencies under cooperative arrangements.

C. Proposed Outreach Activities. Describe the outreach efforts to be provided by the ES staff indicated in item B. These efforts shall include those described in 20 CFR 653.107(i-p).

The outreach plan and activities require the incorporation of specific programmatic and administrative elements which are necessary for an effective and customer-driven effort.

The State agency therefore, also needs to consider the qualitative aspect of said plan and we recommend special attention be given to special customer needs such as: language and cultural barriers, lack of familiarity with the community services which may be available to them, attention to employment areas which may have a history and/or opportunity for worker abuse.

As the MSFW population tends to encounter the above situations in general, special attention must be given to the selection of the outreach staff personnel, the outreach plan, coordination and linkages with community and other MSFW service providers, technical assistance and training for outreach staff and local office staff/management in an effort to ensure service to the MSFW customer is responsive and effective.

### III. ES Services Provided to MSFWs.

All States must ensure efforts to meet no less than the minimum requirements for providing services to MSFWs. All States are required to meet at least four of the five equity indicators including Employment Service (ES) services planned. Significant MSFW States additionally must meet at least four of the seven minimum service level indicators.

States which expect to have difficulty in meeting the MSFW performance indicators shall describe the nature of the problem and measures planned for meeting the performance indicators.

#### A. Plan Data for the Upcoming Year.

If a State's estimated plan data for the current year indicates difficulty in meeting equity indicators, minimum services levels, or planned levels of activity, the following items must be included in a narrative plan:

- 6 a description of the problems;
- 6 specific steps planned to meet minimum service levels; and
- 6 specific steps planned to meet equity level of services.

Federal regulations at 20 CFR 653.112 require the establishment of performance indicators reflecting equity and the measurement of minimum levels of service. The indicators established by ETA include five ES-controlled indicators to measure equity of service, and seven minimum service level indicators. All States are required to meet at least four of the five equity indicators. Significant MSFW States additionally are required to meet at least four of the seven minimum service level indicators.

The seven minimum service level indicators are listed on Table IV.3. These standards are set to encourage appropriate service to MSFWs and to ensure the continuation of such services. The minimum service levels are established annually in accordance with Federal regulations at 20 CFR 653.1(c), reflected in the State agency's outreach plan and responsive to the assessment of needs.

The standards are set at a level high enough to encourage low performing States to improve their performance, but not so high as to make achievement extraordinarily difficult. The five equity indicators for all States are:

1. ratio of non-MSFW to MSFWs referred to jobs.
2. ratio of non-MSFW to MSFWs for whom service is provided.
3. ratio of non-MSFWs to MSFWs referred to supportive services.
4. ratio of non-MSFWs to MSFWs counseled.
5. ratio of non-MSFWs to MSFWs for whom a job development contact was made.

#### B. Significant MSFW Local Office Affirmative Action Plans.

Significant MSFW local offices which are required to develop and submit an Affirmative Action Plan were designated in accordance with 20 CFR 653.111. The designations for PY 1995 of Affirmative Plan offices are provided in Table IV.2.

The Affirmative Action Plan must include a comparison of the racial and ethnic composition of the workforce and that of the local office staff. When the comparison shows an under-representation of a racial or ethnic group in the local office, the plan must establish a reasonable timetable with goals to remedy the imbalance.

#### IV. ES Services Provided to Agricultural Employers.

All States are required to describe efforts planned in providing ES services to agricultural employers. Plan should reflect past State performance in the referral and placement of workers to agricultural employers, and a narrative description of specific

activities reflecting efforts to meet needs of employers whose labor needs are time-sensitive and seasonal in nature.

A. Data Analysis

1. Previous year's history (PY 94 actual data):
  - a. Number of agricultural job opening received;
  - b. Number of agricultural job openings filled.
  - c. Per cent filled  $[(b/a) \times 100]$
  - d. Number of interstate clearance orders received (from other states);
  - e. Number of interstate clearance orders initiated (within your state);
  
2. Plan for upcoming year (based on estimated data):
  - a. Number of agricultural job openings expected;
  - b. Number of agricultural job openings projected to be filled;
  - c. Per cent to be filled  $[(b/a) \times 100]$ .
  - d. Estimated number of interstate clearance orders State will receive.
  - e. Estimated number of interstate clearance orders the State will initiate.

B. Narrative Description - Please include:

1. A description on how the State agency plans to provide ES services to agricultural employers;
  
2. A description of the process used to identify agricultural employers expected to utilize MSFWs;
  
3. A description of the process for linking available workers with the employers, including the cooperation with coordinating groups such as JTPA 402 grantees, agricultural employers organizations, other MSFW service organizations, etc;
  
4. A description of the process State will use to promote ES services available to agricultural employers such as the Agricultural Recruitment System, JSEC, participation in employer conferences, development of marketing tools, labor exchange information to employers. emphasis on recruitment of U.S. workers.

5. Where an H-2A program operated in the State in previous year, describe efforts to increase recruitment and placement of U.S. worker.

V. Attachments to State Plan for Agricultural Services:

Table 1. Significant MSFW States

Table 2. Significant MSFW Local Offices Affirmative Action Plan

Table 3. Minimum Service Level Indicators

Table 4. Significant Local offices and Bilingual Offices, by Region

Table 5. States with the Highest Estimated Year-Round MSFW Activities

Table IV.1                    SIGNIFICANT MSFW STATES FOR PY 1996

TOTAL U.S. MSFW APPLICATIONS    ---    184,634

	<u>States</u>	<u>MSFW Applications</u>
1.	California	37,720
2.	Texas	34,606
3.	Florida	23,262
4.	Washington	15,271
5.	North Carolina	13,747
6.	Michigan	12,226
7.	Puerto Rico	8,558
8.	Arizona	7,638
9.	Georgia	6,048
10.	Oregon	5,262
11.	South Carolina	4,508
12.	Minnesota	4,478
13.	Virginia	4,413
14.	Idaho	2,869
15.	New York	2,736
16.	New Mexico	1,666
17.	Ohio	1,567
18.	Colorado	1,418
19.	Pennsylvania	1,068

20. North Dakota

1,015

Table IV.2

SIGNIFICANT MSFW LOCAL OFFICES--AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS FOR 1996

	<u>MSFW Significant Offices</u>	<u>MSFW Region</u>	<u>MSFW Applications</u>	<u>Cumulative MSFW App.'s</u>
1.	Edinburg, TX	VI	5,192	5,192
2.	Weslaco, TX	VI	5,146	10,338
3.	McAllen, TX	VI	4,758	15,096
4.	Quincy, FL	IV	4,575	19,671
5.	Sunnyside, WA	X	4,012	23,683
6.	Exmore, VA	III	3,847	27,530
7.	Eagle Pass, TX	VI	3,564	31,094
8.	Sanger, CA	IX	2,832	33,926
9.	Yuma, AZ	IX	2,779	36,705
10.	Belle Glade, FL	IV	2,598	39,303

Total MSFW Applications:  $184,634 \times 20\% = 36,927$

Federal regulations at 20 CFR 653.111(b)(1) require that "Affirmative Action Plan" local offices be designated each year. The local offices listed above represent the top 20% of MSFW activity nationally.

Table IV.3

MINIMUM SERVICE LEVEL INDICATORS, PY 1996  
Percentage of MSFWs

Significant MSFW States (PY 1996)	(1) No. MSFWs Placed Wage	(2) Placed \$.50 Above Hourly Jobs	(3) Placed on Long-Term Non-Ag.
Arizona	42.5%	14.0%	3.8%
California	42.5	14.0	4.9
Colorado	42.5	14.0	5.9
Florida	42.5	14.0	6.0
Georgia	42.5	14.0	3.3
Idaho	42.5	14.0	7.3
Illinois	42.5	14.0	8.0
Michigan	42.5	14.0	3.8
Minnesota	42.5	14.0	3.4
New Mexico	42.5	14.0	3.3
New York	42.5	14.0	6.5
North Carolina	42.5	14.0	5.0
North Dakota	42.5	14.0	4.5
Ohio	42.5	14.0	4.4
Oregon	42.5	14.0	6.2
Pennsylvania	42.5	14.0	8.0
Puerto Rico	42.5	4.5	4.0
South Carolina	42.5	14.0	3.9
Texas	42.5	14.0	8.2
Virginia	42.5	14.0	5.2
Washington	42.5	14.0	3.3

Acceptable minimum performance levels for the remaining four indicators are as follows:

- (4) Local Office Reviews: One hundred (100.0) percent of significant MSFW local offices shall be reviewed by State or Federal staff.
- (5) Field Checks: Commencing with PY 95, minimum performance levels were established by the State per 20 CFR 653.112(c).
- (6) Outreach Staff Contacts: Commencing with PY 95, minimum performance levels were established by the State per

20 CFR 653.112(c).

- (7) Complaint Resolution: Commencing with PY 95, minimum performance levels were established by the State per 20 CFR 653.112(c).

Table IV.4

SIGNIFICANT LOCAL OFFICES AND BILINGUAL OFFICES, PY 1996

REGION I

None

REGION II

New Jersey

Hammonton

Vineland/Bridgeton

New York

Albion

Elba

Hudson

Kingston

Lockport

Newark

Pine Island

Riverhead

Puerto Rico

Aguadilla\*

Arecibo\*

Bayamon\*

Caguas\*

Guayama\*

Humacao\*

Mayaguez\*

Ponce\*

Rio Piedras\*

REGION III

Delaware

Dover\*

Maryland

Chestertown\*

Crisfield\*

Hagerstown\*

Pennsylvania

Chambersburg\*

Gettysburg\*

Virginia

Exmore\*

Winchester

West Virginia

Martinsburg

## REGION IV

### Florida

Apollo Beach*	Apopka*
Belle Glade*	Bradenton*
Fort Pierce*	Homestead*
Immokalee*	Naples*
Plant City*	Quincy*
Sebring*	Wauchula*
Winter Haven*	

### Georgia

Americus*	Bainbridge*
Cordele*	Moultrie*
Douglas*	Statesboro*
Tifton*	

### North Carolina

Clinton	Dunn*
Elizabethtown	Greenville*
Hendersonville*	Kenansville*
Kinston	Mount Olive
Oxford*	Sanford
Smithville*	Wilson*

### South Carolina

Aiken*	Beaufort*
Charleston*	Spartanburg*
Sumter*	

## REGION V

### Illinois

Danville*	Kankakee*
Murphy*	Peoria*

### Michigan

Adrian*	Bay City*
Bear Lake*	Greenville*
Hartford*	Sparta*
Traverse City*	

### Minnesota

Crookston*	East Grand Forks
Fergus Falls	Moorhead

Owatonna

Willmar\*

Ohio

Bowling Green\*

Piqua\*

Fremont\*

Wisconsin

Beaver Dam\*

Wautoma\*

REGION VI

New Mexico

Deming Sub-Office\*

Las Cruces\*

Texas

Brownsville\*

Carrizo Springs\*

Del Rio\*

Edinburg\*

Fabens

Harlingen\*

Lamesa

McAllen\*

Pecos

Raymondville\*

Weslaco\*

Canutillo

Crystal City\*

Eagle Pass\*

El Paso Downtown

Floydada Sub-Office\*

Hereford

Laredo

Muleshoe Sub-Office

Plainview\*

Uvalde\*

REGION VII

None

REGION VIII

Colorado

Brighton\*

Greeley\*

Rocky Ford\*

Delta\*

Monte Vista\*

Montana

Sidney\*

North Dakota

Grafton\*

Utah

Brigham City\*

Wyoming

Worland\*

REGION IX

Arizona

Coolidge\*

East Valley\*

Willcox\*

Douglas\*

West Valley\*

Yuma\*

California

Bakersfield (South)\*

Calexico\*

Colusa\*

El Centro\*

Gilroy\*

Hanford\*

Huron\*

Lakeport\*

Lodi\*

Madera\*

Mendota\*

Modesto\*

Oxnard\*

Salinas\*

Santa Maria\*

Ukiah\*

Wasco\*

Woodland\*

Blythe\*

Chico\*

Delano\*

Fresno West\*

Greenfield\*

Hollister\*

Indio\*

Lamont\*

Los Banos\*

Marysville\*

Merced\*

Oroville\*

Porterville\*

Sanger\*

Turlock\*

Visalia\*

Watsonville\*

REGION X

Idaho

Bonner's Ferry\*

Canyon County\*

Mountain Home

Rexbury\*

Burley\*

Emmett\*

Payette\*

Twin Falls\*

Oregon

Madras\*

Woodburn\*

Milton-Freewater\*

Washington

Bellingham  
Ellensburg  
Mount Vernon  
Sunnyside\*  
Walla Walla\*  
Yakima\*

Columbia Gorge\*  
Moses Lake\*  
Okanogan\*  
Tri-Cities\*  
Wenatchee\*

\*Bilingual Offices

Table IV.5

STATES WITH HIGHEST ESTIMATED YEAR-ROUND ACTIVITIES

These are five States with the highest estimated year-round MSFW activities:

California  
Texas  
Florida  
Washington  
North Carolina

The States listed above were selected in accordance with 20 CFR 653.107(i). These States must assign full-time, year-round staff to outreach activities. The remainder of the significant MSFW States shall make maximum efforts to hire outreach staff with MSFW experience of year-round positions and shall assign outreach staff to work full-time during the period of the highest activity.