

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SAN FRANCISCO

Local Workforce Investment Board for the City and County of San Francisco

MINUTES OF THE
APRIL 10, 2014
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
WORKFORCE INVESTMENT COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OF THE
WORKFORCE INVESTMENT SAN FRANCISCO (WISF) BOARD
1 SOUTH VAN NESS AVENUE, 5th FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

Members Present

Dion-Jay Brookter, Young Community Developers
Macio Lyons, SESECDC, Family Service Agency
Doug Parrish, WiCAC Co-Facilitator, Mentoring
Mens Movement (M3)

Matt Poland, United Way of the Bay Area
Winnie Yu, Self-Help for the Elderly
Lily Wong, Communities United for Health and
Justice

Members Absent

Marcy Orosco, WiCAC Co-Facilitator, Harbor
House Re-entry, Salvation Army

OEWD Staff & Notables

Greg Asay, OEWD
Marissa Bloom, OEWD

Randy Quezada, OEWD
Judson True, Office of Supervisor David Chiu

Public

*(As Evidenced by the
Sign-In Sheet)*

Rosario Anaya, MLVS
Diva Conrad, City College of San Francisco
Natalie Hopner, MLVS
Kimanthe Kithica, MHH/SOMECE
John Knox, JPD

Josh Lachs, Goodwill
Reymon La Choux, Success Center SF
Maureen Sedonaen, Goodwill
Chris Tugwell, MEDA
Petra, Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center

Roll Call

WiCAC Co-Facilitator Doug Parrish called the meeting to order at 10:10 A.M. and asked WiCAC members and members of the public to introduce themselves.

Adoption of the Agenda *(Action Item)*

Doug Parrish called for a motion to adopt the agenda. Winnie Yu made a motion to adopt. Seconded and carried, the agenda was adopted.

Proposed Amendments to San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 30

*(Discussion and Possible
Action Item)*

Greg Asay introduced Judson True, Legislative Aide with the office of Board of Supervisors President David Chiu, who emphasized that the amendments are part of an overall alignment effort including the City departments, appointed bodies, legislators, and community stakeholders that are engaged in workforce development.

Greg Asay highlighted the major legislative changes to Chapter 30 that would impact the WiCAC:

Committee on City Workforce Alignment ("Alignment Committee")

An interdepartmental body would be implemented, comprised of the department directors from OEWD's Workforce Development Division, the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), Human Services Agency (HSA), Department of Children, Youth and their Families (DCYF), and Department of Public Works (DPW), plus 1 Mayoral appointment and 1 Board of Supervisors appointment. This body would focus on ensuring the coordination of the City's workforce program planning and investments. The Alignment Committee would also develop and submit a citywide workforce development plan to the Workforce Investment San Francisco (WISF) board every 5 years.

Changes to the WiCAC

Name

The WiCAC would be renamed to the WISF Advisory Committee.

Membership and Appointments

The membership would increase to 8 members, and appointments would no longer come through the Transitional Aged Youth (TAY) board, the Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB) or the Reentry Council. Instead, appointments would be split evenly between the Mayor (4) and the Board of Supervisors (4). The amendments also include a proposal urging the Mayor to appoint a member of the WISF Advisory Committee to the Workforce Investment San Francisco (WISF) board.

Composition and Conflicts of Interest

The amendments also include a shift to appointing Executive Director or CEO level members, and removing the provision about precluding the WiCAC chair from receiving City funds.

Judson True added that the transition and timing of these changes are still in development, but that a hearing is tentatively scheduled at the Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee on Thursday, May 8th. Greg Asay added that the meeting is a public meeting and encouraged board members and public to attend.

Discussion followed.

Doug Parrish commented that the WISF cannot be effective without the voice of the on-the-ground providers. He also asked for clarification on how the WISF appointment would be determined, and asked whether a member of the WiCAC could have a seat on the Alignment Committee.

Matt Poland shared that he saw some positive changes (amendments no longer bar providers who receive workforce funding from sitting on the WiCAC, and the Alignment Committee is a good solution for getting City departments on the same page) but that he has concerns.

Lily Wong asked whether the amendments could be moved forward without WiCAC approval. Judson and Greg said they would verify it but that, under current legislation, they would have the opportunity to review and comment but would not vote to approve.

Matt asked for a distinction between the OEWD Local Plan and the Alignment Committee's 5-year Plan. Greg responded that they should have synergy, but the OEWD Local Plan is prescriptive on WIA funding (versus more diverse funding sources). Judson said his office would look at the way the two Plans interact.

Doug suggested that the WiCAC conduct a +/- exercise to review the impact of the amendments. He asked what federal entity advises the WISF, and whose recommendations would be adhered to (between the Alignment Committee and the Advisory Committee). Greg clarified that the WiCAC was created on a local level, and gave historical context. Judson added that the intent of the alignment process is to layer the local process with the state and federal mandates.

Matt asked whether the WiCAC would have an opportunity to submit changes to the draft before the May hearing. Judson confirmed that there is time to do so, and reflected back the questions that he heard from members:

1. How does an Advisory Committee member get selected to serve on the WISF?
2. How does the WISF Advisory Committee provide comment on the City's Local Plan and the OEWD Local Plan (comment or approval)?
3. What is the transitional period from the current WiCAC to the new WISF Advisory Committee?

Judson clarified that minor changes to the proposed legislation can be made in committee, but that substantive changes would require substitute legislation. Minor changes could be made at the Board level on the Tuesday prior to the May hearing.

Winnie Yu asked how the meeting schedules of the WiCAC and the WISF will align to allow for the 30-day comment period, and whether any legislation exists that would block the logistical flow.

Matt added that the WiCAC should generate a +/- list to determine an appropriate response.

Dion-Jay Brookter commented that changing membership to an Executive Director-level representative is limiting.

Judson commented that, on some committees, there's an opportunity to designate an alternate representative. Matt added that several of the organizations may provide a variety of services and that an E.D. or C.E.O. may not be the best choice.

Lily commented that not specifying Reentry, Homeless and TAY categories as a requirement would have a negative impact on representation for those communities.

Doug asked why the choice was made to increase membership to 8. Judson suggested that the rationale may have been to provide balance between the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, and to encourage consensus-based decision making.

Greg added that the WiCAC has a regularly scheduled meeting on April 29th and that there would be another opportunity to review and give feedback to the recommended amendments. Judson committed to bringing back the questions that have been raised and to work with his office to informally incorporate some of the recommended changes. He suggested that his office submit the recommended amendments to the WiCAC to react to at the next meeting. The categories of questions that he will bring back to his office are:

1. Transition timeline of existing governance to the proposed body
2. Timeline for review, comment and approval (where possible) for the Local Plans
3. Composition of the new Advisory Committee related to the E.D. requirement
4. Status of existing required Reentry, Homeless and TAY seats
5. Number of members of the Committee (from 7 to 8)

Doug underscored the importance of retaining the original intention of the WiCAC.

Public Comment
(Discussion Item)

Doug Parrish called for public comment.

Kimanthe Kithica, MHH/SOMEK, asked whether things are more complex or less complex. Judson True responded that the proposed changes will make things less complex, as Chapter 30 does not currently capture how the City is managing workforce dollars.

Chris Tugwell, MEDA, commented that broadening the membership beyond CEOs is important.

Rosario Anaya, MLVS, commented that the role of the CBOs needs to be discussed more to ensure that the information on what is happening in their communities comes back to the group.

Joshua Lachs, Goodwill, commented that the intention of the changes are on point, and asked what weight the new Advisory Committee's recommendations will have. Judson responded that there was discontent on the CBO level (gathered from conversations with the CBO Budget Coalition) with how workforce investments were made in the recent budget cycle, adding that the revised legislation will elevate the level of input that CBOs have. Joshua commented that this seemed to be a strong case for changing the membership to ED or CEO level, and that the new structure seems intuitively more streamlined (the three angles of the WISF, Advisory Committee and Alignment Committee working together), but that he wanted to hear more about the benefits.

Matt Poland commented that changing Advisory Committee membership to ED or CEO level does not

necessarily give the Committee more weight, and asked whether it increases or solves for the “pie problem” (CBOs fighting for their slice of the pie). Joshua commented that it would be beneficial to define the portfolio of issues that the Advisory Committee would be charged with, which may better define who needs to be at the table.

Diva Conrad, CCSF, commented that she shares Rosario’s concerns about CBO involvement and asked whether training facilities like CCSF would have an opportunity to have a voice, potentially as a tiebreaking vote on the revised Advisory body.

Natalie Hopner, MLVS, added that her agency was not invited to participate in the CBO Budget Coalition, and she’s concerned about agencies like hers not having an opportunity to participate in conversations pertaining to how City workforce dollars are spent. She asked Judson if there will be an application process to fill vacancies on the Committee. Judson responded that, traditionally, vacancies are publicly noticed on an annual basis. Greg Asay added that OEWD notices these vacancies as well, and recommended that everyone make sure they are on OEWD’s mailing list. Natalie added that “urging” appointment recommendations to the WISF is an important point to bring back to Supervisor Chiu to ensure diverse and direct CBO involvement.

Doug called for a motion to request the amendments to the proposed Chapter 30 legislation. Dion-Jay made a motion, and Matt amended the motion to include a request that Supervisor Chiu’s office confirm what is possible to change so that WiCAC members can develop a final list for approval at the April 29 meeting. Seconded and carried as amended, the WiCAC unanimously approved the motion.

Greg announced that the this meeting would be the last one for member Macio Lyons, and thanked him for his service on the Committee.

Adjournment
(Action Item)

Doug Parrish called for motion to adjourn the meeting. Dion-Jay Brookter made a motion to adjourn. Seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 12:02 P.M.