



## WDC ARRA-WIA Funding Survey Results

In July, 2009, The U.S. Conference of Mayors conducted a survey of its Workforce Development Council to determine the status of ARRA funding under WIA and how workforce funds were being drawn down. According to the survey responses, it is clear that ARRA funds have not resulted in slower expenditure of WIA Formula dollars.

Over 90% of cities surveyed reported that they have not delayed spending regular WIA Formula funds so that ARRA funds will be spent first. Of the cities indicating they had delayed spending WIA Formula Funds, only one city responded that it had delayed drawing down WIA formula funding, while the remaining cities only “somewhat” delayed using their regular WIA allocations.

The cities surveyed are using ARRA funds for the following hard-to-serve populations: drop-outs (100%), older youth (100%), ex-offenders (89%), homeless (78%), long-term unemployed (78%), in need of ESL (70%), single parents, and other (33% including youth who are disabled, court-involved, in foster care, have runaway or have gang affiliations in addition to disabled adults).

### I. ARRA Reporting Requirements

#### **Have the reporting requirements for ARRA caused serious problems?**

**While only 3.6% of respondents had serious problems with ARRA reporting requirements, forty-three percent of respondents described various problems they experienced from the ARRA reporting requirements.**

- **In Boston**, Career Center employees had difficulties determining which program is the most appropriate for each participant. There are four separate funding categories: Formula WIA, ARRA, Wagner Peyser, and Wagner Peyser ARRA. It is not about eligibility, that is not an issue, but which funding stream makes the most sense. Trying to determine if a placement or employer service is related to an ARRA project is time consuming because definitions are missing and guidance is lacking. Having two separate planning processes (ARRA and FY'10) at nearly the same time has also been time consuming and perhaps unnecessary, integrating them would have been a better choice. Also budget management of multiple pieces of funding and different timelines is administratively burdensome.
- **In Cambridge**, the frequency of reporting requirements created a reporting burden.
- **In Chicago**, ARRA's compressed timeline made it challenging to plan appropriately for such a large volume of jobs for the summer program. Also, process of entering youth data into the system was extremely human resource intensive. The high level of staff hours necessary for the data entry process, combined with the short timeline and a log of 7,000 youth, made it difficult to report in a timely manner.
- **In Denver**, a separate tracking system was created in order to satisfy data requests and a lot of time is being spent in responding to various levels of government i.e., city, state, federal and the media regarding use of the ARRA funds which inhibits the ability to implement programs and use the funding.

- **In Killeen, TX**, measurement systems, such as for jobs created, are not in place and they receive reporting requests from numerous partners and stakeholders with no streamlined system to report data in a location to be accessed by all interested parties. It would be helpful to have a transparent system accessible by partners and the public.
- **In Philadelphia**, there are constant requests for youth program information at the federal, state, and local level.
- **In Portland**, fiscal reporting by the 5<sup>th</sup> of the month does not allow for accurate and timely accrual accounting.
- **In Seattle**, more staff time is needed for increased data entry requirements under ARRA, such as entering information on supportive services provided.
- **In Spokane, WA**, the WIB and providers are experiencing increased administrative burdens to track and report ARRA data.
- **In St. Louis**, putting all the information in the computerized case management system (Toolbox) and hard copy files takes too much time away from actually running the program, especially when required information comes “piece-meal” instead of all at once, and monitors need the issues fixed with explanations within a week. They have over 1,600 participants and it is near impossible to get everything “perfect.” Minimal requirements for participation would ease the burden.
- **In Tucson, AZ**, the state-provided database is not flexible and creates difficulties in making changes.

## **II. Summer Jobs**

**Are there things that you feel need to be changed if there is another reiteration of a Summer Jobs program? Please include legislative, technical, etc.?**

**Almost all (96%) cities surveyed had changes they would like to see in a reiteration of a Summer Jobs Program. The top three most common recommendations were:**

- 1) Reduce, minimize or eliminate eligibility requirements since current eligibility requirements are burdensome, resource intensive and require too much documentation, lengthening the time it takes to move youth into jobs. Suggestions to streamline the process include providing alternatives to individual income certification such as allowing for cross-program eligibility with other federal programs including using PUMAs, Free and Reduced Lunch, TANF, and SCHIP.
- 2) Give more advance notice of funding, guidelines, applicable rules, and policy and funding changes; and allocate funding sooner to provide for more time to plan, coordinate, revamp contracting methods, partner with employers and community organizations, and execute the

program in a timely manner. There was not enough time to solicit, receive, review and select proposals in time to also do outreach. Many programs are beginning planning for 2010 now.

- 3) Increase the income level for eligible youth. Many disadvantaged youth do not qualify for the program.

**Recommendations from selected cities include:**

**Baltimore:** Eligibility determination should allow for use of alternative eligibility verification of low income such as use of the microdata areas (PUMAs) Free Lunch and TANF participation

**Boston:** The following changes need to be made to any future Youth Summer Jobs program, and we fully support reestablishing a Federal Summer Jobs program: Make the Income Eligibility requirement match other federal programs for which most low income families have already applied, such as Free and Reduced Lunch; Allow WIA Administrators to “take notice” of the income qualification of another governmental agency so we do not need to re-collect that information from families; Make the Income Eligibility requirement follow the Regional HUD guidelines not the National poverty guidelines.

In high cost areas of the country (like the Northeast and Pacific Northwest to cite two), there are fewer eligible youth per capita than in sections of the country with lower costs of living, but in our local economies, they are just as poor; Remove the “additional barriers” from the eligibility requirements, being low income should be the only requirement. It is common sense that low income youth will almost always have one or more of the current barriers and we have found that young people have found providing this additional information to be a burden, insulting, and destructive to their self-esteem; change the youth allocation formula so funding is based solely on the number of disadvantaged youth in a region, the adult unemployment rate is an unnecessary and in some cases distorts the distribution of funds.

We can cite several examples from MA where regions with vastly fewer disadvantaged youth, but high adult unemployment rates are receiving very large amounts of funding to serve a fairly small number of eligible youth. The per capita range in MA runs from a high of \$572 per youth to a low of \$72 (the state’s wealthiest region) – Boston’s per capita allocation for its share of disadvantaged youth is \$111

**Chicago:** The documentation requirements for establishing eligibility are widely viewed as excessively burdensome and resource intensive. Streamline the eligibility verification process and allow for cross-program eligibility by aligning the summer jobs program with other programs such as Reduced School Lunch Program and State Children’s Health Insurance Program, for example: Provide advanced notice of policy changes and funding so that local government can better plan/coordinate with employers and community based organization; Provide more technical assistance, best practice sharing and program guidance through contacts at the local level.

**Houston:** For the last two program years, we have lost WIA formula funds. This money is at the heart of our regional service delivery system. We’ve had to close local offices and lay off staff just as our traffic and individuals needing jobs started to increase. The Recovery Act money is welcome, but we cannot use it to provide basic service for almost 500,000 individuals who will register with us this year.

- Youth income guidelines need to parallel the adult poverty requirements in WIA.
- There is an inconsistency in the ages allowed for participants in DOL programs.

- 14-17 year olds should be classified as youth
- 18-24 should be classified young adults.
- The summer youth program should not be considered an employment solution for out-of-school participants.
- There should be a clear expectation between expenditures in year-round and Summer Jobs and some flexibility of the movement of the money is needed because some communities may need more attention than others.

**New York City:** WIA income eligibility requirements for Summer Jobs for youth should be eliminated or simplified to allow qualifications for other federal programs help determine eligibility for WIA-funded programs.

**Park Ridge, IL:** Having alternative programs for youth that come from households that do not meet WIA income eligibility. Criteria should be determined for youth who may have adequate family (financial) support, can participate on a limited level that will allow for them to utilize some of the resources available through WIA in developing or strengthening their career plans.

**Philadelphia:** The eligibility documentation process caused significant challenges for the system. As part of reauthorization, alternatives to individual income certification needs to be considered, including income proxies and automatic eligibility of high-risk populations such as youth offenders and out-of-school-youth (similar to current eligibility for foster care youth).

**Portland:** No limitations on the kind of work sites, and more lead time to include a stronger academic component

**San Diego:** Funding for stand-alone summer youth employment programs should be reinstated in reauthorization of WIA; Income eligibility requirements should be raised to serve more youth in need; Federal free lunch eligibility should substitute for traditional income eligibility for in-school youth; The summer youth employment program should continue to serve youth ages 14-24.

**Scranton, PA:** Expand the income guidelines to 235% of Poverty level and eliminate additional barrier for enrollment.

**St. Louis:** Minimal reporting requirements, increase the 5% that don't have to meet income guidelines to at least 30% that don't have to meet income guidelines, strengthened communication from DOL to local government departments on what this means for everyone and how infrastructure needs to be in place to assist agencies (payroll issues—IT system antiquated, not enough staff at city level). We definitely need more planning time, as well. We would need to have at least 6 months advance notice to plan a program of this magnitude.

**Youngston, OH:** Our area received over 2,000 applications for summer employment. However, were only able to serve 530 given our funding limitations. Any additional funding would be valuable.

### **III. Adult Funding**

**A. Are there any issues that you feel need to be addressed for Adult Funding? Please identify any problems that you have had in spending these funds.**

**Nineteen percent (19%) of respondents identified issues they felt needed to be addressed in Adult Funding.**

- **In New York**, they are focusing on programs that can train and place individuals in a 10 month time frame. While this is mostly fine, they are not able to engage individuals in longer term trainings as much as they would like.
- **In Park Ridge, IL**, they are experiencing an increased volume of dislocated workers seeking services at the local centers, but the 1A population is retreating from the centers and seeking assistance through other social service agencies or not attempting to re-enter the workforce. The Workforce Board of Northern Cook County has identified income support as the main barrier to the 1A population's ability to participate in training activities. Given this barrier, the Board has incorporated needs-related payments, class size training and on-the-job training into its package of available services in an effort to spend ARRA funds on training activities for the 1A population.
- **In Philadelphia**, the short turnaround time for reporting obligation and allocation of funds necessitated an abbreviated RFP process, which may have limited the industry diversity and quality of responses for both Adult and Dislocated Worker training.
- **In Seattle**, though ARRA funding increased the total budgets, they endured a significant cut in WIA formula, which is of great concern if ARRA money is not continued past June 30, 2010.

**Houston was the only city surveyed to identify a problem they had in spending Adult Funding.** In Houston, there are minimal expenditure levels dedicated to training. Workforce professionals receive multiple requests for occupations which are not on the High-Skill & High Growth Occupation Lists and they are unable to fund these requests.

**B. Are you able to put more clients into training with ARRA funding?**

**Over ninety percent (93%) of cities have seen more adults come into their One-Stop Career Centers, with an 47% average increase in Adult One-Stop traffic. One hundred percent (100%) of all respondents reported being able to put more clients into training with ARRA funding, however only 65 % were able to serve all of their Adult clients.**

- **In Baltimore**, a Request for Expressions of Interest was released in May 2009 which will allow the Mayor's Office of Employment Development to acquire a more diverse menu of training options for local job seekers. They hope to train 350 customers using ARRA funds.

- **In Boston**, all FY'09 training funds were expended by April 2009 (ITA availability is distributed twice a year to ensure some training opportunities year round). For FY10, Boston is experiencing a 28% cut in Dislocated Worker funds and 12% in Disadvantaged Adults, so realistically the ARRA funds basically ensured they could break even for this two year window. With the ARRA funding in both Adult titles, Boston had planned to distribute 136 ITAs (68 in each category) and they currently have only 12 ARRA ITAs remaining. There is already a waiting list, meaning they will be distributed soon. They are nearing the completion of a procurement process for approximately 100 group training slots (75% 1A funds and 25% 1D) and they expect to award contracts in time for September/October enrollments.
- **In Burnsville**, they are co-enrolling TANF clients into short-term training programs.
- **In Canton, OH**, more individuals can now attend occupational skills training at the area adult workforce centers and colleges.
- **In Denver**, they are focusing on three industries: construction/skilled trades, energy and health care. They have targeted use of funding for ITAs, wage subsidies/OJTs, support services and customized training.
- **In Fort Worth, TX**, they have doubled their capacity to provide training which mirrors the demand in the Adult program and is not enough for the demand in the Dislocated Worker program.
- **In Killeen, TX**, overall training was increased by 46% when looking at regular WIA Adults in training compared to training for the WIA eligible Adults using ARRA funds.
- **In New York City**, they expect to serve over 5,000 more people and are offering hard occupational skills training to over 2,500 people (including both Adults and Dislocated Workers).
- **In Park Ridge, IL**, an increased number of 1A clients are expected to enter training activities through ARRA given the available supportive service options along with the array of training methods being offered.
- **In Pasadena, CA**, more ITAs can be issued and customized training in green and health occupations can now be provided.
- **In Philadelphia**, during the first round of funding, they expect to offer training to an additional 631 adult and dislocated workers.
- **In Phoenix**, they have increased OJT, WEX and training including truck driving and horse shoeing for both Adult and Dislocated Workers.
- **In Portland**, WSI has developed a comprehensive budget for the implementation of WIA formula and ARRA resources that focuses on greatly increased levels of customer services; particularly in Occupational Skills Training, Supportive Services and Needs Related Payments.

- **In San Diego**, they have contracted training with public institutions of higher education, increased the number Individual Training Accounts and increased the number of contracts in customized training for both Adult and Dislocated Workers.
- **In Scranton**, by allowing for "cohort training" activities, substantially more customers can be served with the funds available for both Adult and Dislocated Workers.
- **In Seattle, WA**, ARRA funds are being prioritized for training. ARRA, like other WIA funds, helps to balance out other training funds for the low-income population that are beginning to run dry, such as Basic Food Employment and Training and the state Opportunity Grants. Also, because they can now fund cohorts, they have expanded the capacity of the college system to train people in high-wage/high-demand fields. The first cohort class began in July at South Seattle Community College, training 20 students as Licensed Practical Nurses. Most were pulled from long waiting lists at the college. They plan to start many new cohort classes this fall.
- **In Spokane**, they appreciate the flexibility to offer cohort-based training for both Adult and Dislocated Workers that gives local areas another tool to serve high demand business workforce needs and to work directly with educational institutions to offer training and more quickly deliver instruction and credentials so that individuals can return to work more quickly.
- **In St. Louis**, they were unable to serve all the clients that requested and were approved for training last year due to a lack of funds. This year, ARRA funding should allow them to put everyone into training that requests it.
- **In Tacoma**, ARRA funds were a crucial given the continued formula funds reduction over the years. With the funds, they've purchased group training at the community and technical colleges to ensure continued training access as state budget shortfalls take their toll at these institutions.
- **In Tucson, AZ**, they have a backlog and have already obligated about ¼ of their ARRA Adult funds to training participants.
- **In Youngstown, OH**, they have expanded capacity to account for the additional customers and see much more interest in training due to the decline in the economy.

**C. Are you able to provide any needs-related payments to clients in training?**

**Fifty-Eight (58%) percent of respondents reported being able to provide needs-related payments to clients in training.**

- **In Baltimore**, funds beyond tuition and training costs will take the form of stipends for participants for some of the training offerings.
- **In Boston**, historically support for transportation to and from training has been provided and continues to be provided for Adult and Dislocated Workers with ARRA funds. The same agency which is Boston's WIA Administrator also manages the City's HUD/CDBG Public Service

funding and we are able to fund a number of support services through these funds, thus relieving the necessity of spending a large portion of WIA funds for these services. The policy has been to focus as much funding as possible on skills training and contextualized adult literacy programming with WIA funds.

- **In Canton, OH**, they have increased supportive services for both Adult and Dislocated Workers.
- **In Chicago**, they are tentatively able to provide NRPs, pending formal policy approval by the local board for both Dislocated Workers and Adult training. NRPs will be provided to a portion of trainees, as long as funds targeted for this service remain. Since need is greater than the available funds (the entire allocation could be spent on NRPs), this service will have to be rationed both in terms of the amount of NRP payments to each individual and the number of trainees receiving payments.
- **In Fort Worth, TX**, since they have just recently begun to provide this support service, it is a little too early to know the volume or impact that will result.
- **In Houston**, funding for childcare, books, uniforms, tools, fees, and transportation are provided to Dislocated Workers and Adults in training.
- **In Kansas City, MO**, funding for transportation, supplies, clothing, books and uniforms are provided.
- **In Killeen, TX**, they are utilizing the funding for training.
- **In New York**, they are offering transportation and childcare payments to Adults and Dislocated Workers in training meeting specific criteria.
- **In Park Ridge, IL**, needs related payments have been made available to participants identified by their case managers as being in need in an effort to increase training participation and successful completion.
- **In Pasadena, CA**, they can now provide needs-related payments for needy clients (i.e., all WIA allowable needs-based payments are made available on a case by case basis).
- **In Philadelphia**, to optimize the number of individuals who are able to receive training supported by ARRA funds, the Philadelphia WIB members set a policy to limit the investment in needs-related payments to formula WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker funds.
- **In Portland**, Worksystems Inc. (WSI) will be revising its policies and procedures around Supportive Services and Needs Related Payments for Adults and Dislocated Workers in order to implement a greater level of supports for customers in training during the stimulus period. The budget this year reflects greatly increased levels of Support Services and Needs Related Payments in line with the intent of ARRA, including designated budget minimums to support these program areas.



- **In San Diego**, the needs-related payment policy is currently under development for Adults and Dislocated Workers.
- **In Scranton**, the local WIB developed supportive service policy for Adults and Dislocated Workers that includes transportation allowances, special circumstances for employment (i.e., expanded day care costs, car repairs, etc), and an incentive for obtaining employment.
- **In Seattle**, they choose not to offer needs-related payments to Adults and Dislocated Workers because of the cost, but do provide supportive services to support client needs (including transportation, tools, clothing, basic needs, etc.) while they are in training.
- **In Spokane, WA** the constraints around using NRPs *per se* have led the local area to broaden the use of supportive services for Adult and Dislocated Workers in lieu of NRPs. The same principles govern their use in offering meaningful levels of financial support to ensure customers can access and complete their training and transition into family wage employment.
- **In St. Louis**, ARRA funds pay for transportation assistance, textbooks, exams, etc. for Adults and Dislocated Workers.
- **In Sunnyvale, CA**, there are not enough resources to provide needs-related payments to Adult and Dislocated Workers.
- **In Tacoma, WA** there are not enough ARRA funds to do this and increase training capacity. The priority is to ensure clients are eligible and able to take advantage of training to position for jobs when the economy picks up.
- **In Tucson, AZ**, they chose not to set up new administrative procedures to use NRPs for Adult and Dislocated Workers. Instead, support payments allowed to vendors for child care, housing, transportation were increased for those in training. CSBG and ARRA funds are also being used, and some HUD funds may be accessed to provide support to those in training and in need.

#### **IV. Dislocated Worker Funding**

**A. Are there any things that you would like to see changed in Dislocated Worker funding? Please identify any problems that you have had in spending these funds.**

**Thirty percent (30%) of respondents reported issues they would like to see changed in Dislocated Worker funding.**

- **In Houston, TX**, applicants are not having any problems with paying the required co-payments. The issues are: most Dislocated Workers are concentrating more on returning to work rather than gaining additional skills through training; better marketing is needed.
- **In New York**, the requirement to work with Dislocated Workers through a connection to the One-Stop Career Center creates extra steps for jobseekers and contractors. Alternative Service Providers do not require a connection to the One Stop to the same degree.

- **In Park Ridge, IL**, with the volume of Dislocated Workers requesting and accessing training, it is anticipated that ARRA funds will be spent in their entirety through the various training avenues, however WIA performance outcomes will be impacted. Performance outcomes could be measured through different criteria to determine results achieved with both ARRA and WIA funds.
- **In Pasadena, CA**, they would like to see sequential service requirements and Work First policies eliminated.
- **In Phoenix**, it is sometimes difficult to establish layoff status per the regulations so some are entered as adults.
- **In Sunnyvale, CA**, 100% of Dislocated Worker ARRA funding was put into tuition and it has been spent entirely. They can no longer take applications for training unless more resources can be accessed. The state of California says their monies are obligated.
- **In Tucson**, application of the Performance Measure for Credentials is not very practical. During the last serious recession in the early 1980s the Dislocated Worker program was just being created and there were no credentialing performance measures. Experience from that period and the dislocations of the 1970s has shown that while people enter into training programs in good faith, when they get a real job offer they will take it and drop out of training.
- **In Youngstown, OH**, they are continuing outreach to the Dislocated Worker population and have seen over a 100% increase at the One Stop Centers. However, there are many more Dislocated Workers in the area that remain hesitant in seeking assistance.

**Several cities specified that they had had no problems spending these funds including Fort Worth, TX; Pasadena, CA; and Tucson, AZ. Only Seattle reported any difficulty in spending funds:**

- **In Seattle**, they need longer than 1 year to spend funds since a number of training programs, especially for higher skill sets, are longer than a year.

**B. Are you able to put more clients into training with ARRA funding?**

**Eighty-eight percent of cities surveyed have seen an increase in dislocated workers with an average increase of 50% in Dislocated Worker One-Stop traffic. One hundred percent (100%) of cities surveyed are able to put more Dislocated Workers into training with ARRA funding, although only 73 % were able to serve all of their dislocated workers.**

- **In Burnsville, MN**, thanks to additional funding for training, they have flexibility of how to best serve the client and ARRA is a wonderful supplement to the WIA Dislocated Worker funding.
- **In Canton, OH**, ARRA funds have allowed them to double the number of individuals that can be sent for training.

- **In Chicago**, they are dedicating a significant portion of ARRA funds to training while also targeting funds at expanding the route to training by registering, assessing, case managing and providing support services such as needs-related payments to larger numbers of customers, as well as providing increased placement and retention services for those in training and others who are WIA-registered.
- **In Fort Worth, TX**, capacity to provide training has doubled and it is still not enough for the demand. Unemployment claimants in the area have risen by 1600% in the last year.
- **In Houston, TX**, funds are available, but minimal requests have been received.
- **In Killeen, TX**, training has been increased by 58% when comparing regular WIA Dislocated Workers in training to training for the WIA eligible Dislocated Workers using ARRA funded.
- **In Park Ridge, IL**, ARRA funds coupled with WIA have allowed for expansion of service offerings and tailored training options for individual participants. To date, \$1.1 million in ARRA funds have been obligated for individual training accounts.
- **In Pasadena, CA**, ARRA funds are used to supplement training expenses via ITAs.
- **In Philadelphia**, ARRA funding will support the training of an additional 631 adult and dislocated workers, beyond the number of individuals who will enter formula WIA-funded training. There has also been an increase in the mix of training providers and programs, including those offered by local colleges and universities.
- **In Phoenix**, truck driving, OJT, and Work Experience (WEX) have been increased.
- **In Seattle**, in PY08 350 dislocated workers were put into training, and in PY09 it will be 432 with ARRA alone and 525 with WIA formula, for a total of 957 total in PY09. Not only are they able to serve more in general, but they are also able to serve students who were at risk of dropping out of their training programs because of the exhaustion of state Worker Retraining dollars at the community colleges.
- **In St. Louis**, more and more dislocated workers are using the services and there is a need for additional training to be competitive in this market.
- **In Sunnyvale, CA**, there are 530 in training as opposed to 30 last year.
- **In Tucson, AZ**, they were maxing out regular dollars and have already obligated 1/3 of the Dislocated Worker ARRA funds to trainees.

**C. Are you able to provide any needs-related payments to clients in training?**

**Fifty-eight (58%) percent of cities surveyed reported being able to provide needs-related payments to Dislocated Worker clients in training. Many cities reported similar situations in providing needs-related payments to Dislocated Workers as they have when providing payments for Adult Training. Please see Adult Training needs-related payment section (III. C.) for details.**

- **In Fort Worth, TX**, needs-related payments will be provided to those customers meeting all criteria of the regulations. With extensions to UI and Rapid Re-employment efforts, there are not very many dislocated workers that are expected to meet that criteria.
- **In Kansas City, MO**, funds were utilized for training.
- **In Park Ridge, IL**, needs related payments have been made available to participants identified by their case managers as being in need in an effort to increase training participation and successful completion; however ARRA funds are available to a smaller percentage of Dislocated Workers.
- **In Pasadena, CA**, ARRA funds are used to supplement training expenses via ITAs.

**V. Beyond DOL**

**Are you working with either the Department of Energy or the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to fund Community Action Agencies (CAA) to provide training for Weatherization?**

**Over half (58%) percent of respondents are working with either the Department of Energy or the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to fund Community Action Agencies to provide training for Weatherization.**

- **In Baltimore**, they have received a CSBG award to provide workforce services to residents seeking services at the Community Action Centers. They have also worked in partnership with the community college to identify qualified instructors to teach the CETECH courses that Maryland has authorized and are working with them to ensure that dislocated and incumbent workers receive the appropriate training for weatherization.
- **In Boston**, they work closely with and fund the local Community Action Partnership (CAP) agency (ABCD) for a variety of programs and services, in both the Adult and Youth programming arenas. They have had extensive conversations with ABCD, the local utilities, and their home auditing contractors regarding the weatherization work which will be undertaken due to ARRA. The Greater Boston labor market has approximately 30,000 trained, skilled, and experienced trades people collecting unemployment, many of whom would jump at the chance to return to work, including on residential retrofits. Weatherization is not a new industry in the Northeast or Boston. In the region, the field has long-established firms and contractors who provide both auditing assessments and the retrofitting work. They estimate nearly no additional hiring to absorb the additional work under the ARRA. The most recent estimate was perhaps an additional 3 work crews would be needed in Boston to do the retrofitting; this would be at most

12 new jobs. The New England Carpenters Union along with several community groups and seasoned business folks have looked at the market and feel there is simply not enough work to be done to justify starting up a community/labor/business partnership effort.

- **In Burnsville, MN**, they have discussed options with the community development agency which already had training funding available within its budget allocation and doesn't need anything from the public workforce system. It also seemed as though most contractors were going to use the weatherization funding to keep existing crews busy, rather than hiring new folks.
- **In Canton, OH**, they have approached the Department of Energy and HUD regarding a partnership.
- **In Kansas City, MO**, FEC has set up its first Weatherization Training Class.
- **In Killeen, TX**, they are coordinating with CAA using the existing pool of contractors.
- **In Park Ridge, IL**, the Illinois WorkNet Centers in Arlington Heights and Evanston are working with the Community and Economic Development Association of Cook County, Inc. (CEDA) to assist in establishing training for their Weatherization employment opportunities.
- **In Pasadena, CA**, they are designing programs and services to be responsive to current and forthcoming grant solicitations from these agencies. They are also working with city departments and affiliate partners who have received ARRA funding to coordinate and leverage services.
- **In Philadelphia**, while the local workforce investment area is not working directly with the Departments of Energy or Housing and Urban Development, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Department of Labor and Industry is in collaboration with these agencies to develop weatherization programs to be carried out by Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) operators in Philadelphia to which customers of the public workforce system can participate. The Philadelphia WIB will work with the WAP operators to help coordinate the program and connect to participants through the local One-Stop Career Center. Lastly, the Philadelphia WIB has begun conversing with the Philadelphia Housing Authority (PHA), the local HUD-funded agency, to coordinate activities funded by HUD and ARRA to ensure alignment and effective connection to these programs by public housing residents.
- **In Phoenix, AZ**, they are working on a "green grant" to fund this type of training.
- **In Portland, OR**, plans are in development for the CAAs in both counties to hire the graduates of the ARRA-funded Home Weatherization Training program.
- **In Scranton, PA**, the Scranton-Lackawanna Human Development Agency (SLHDA), Inc., a large umbrella Community Action Association of Pennsylvania (CAAP), is the parent company of the Lackawanna County, PA WIB/WIA staff. Coordination for the provision of weatherization processes/programs is significantly linked with on-going process under development including training of workers and employ of those completing training.

- **In Seattle, WA**, they are connected to these efforts through one of the contractors which is a Community Action Agency and through a board member. They are also leading an energy-efficiency training effort locally that will include weatherization, and are heavily involved in planning for green jobs grants.
- **In Spokane, WA**, HUD funding is piped through existing infrastructure and the public workforce investment system has not been able to offer additional assistance to determine or meet weatherization training needs for CAA programs. The WIB is working with local partner to develop grant applications in response to Department of Energy Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOA).
- **In St. Louis** they are looking into this and are considering integrating it into an existing ex-offender program, but haven't done anything yet
- **In Sunnyvale, CA**, they are collaborating with Sacred Heart in San Jose.
- **In Tucson, AZ**, they are collaborating as far as possible. The weatherization funds have a training fund set-a-side, but the provider of this training and certification is not on the Eligible Training Provider List so they cannot use WIA funds for it. However, they have gotten one Dislocated Worker hired onto a weatherization crew.
- **In Youngstown, OH**, they have reached out to the local CAP Agencies to coordinate with the Weatherization program. To date, they have provided recruitment/screening services.



## WDC ARRA-WIA Funding Survey Results

### Overall Issues

There is concern that ARRA funding is being spent at the cost of drawing down regular Formula Funds.

<p>Have you delayed spending regular WIA Formula Funds so that ARRA Funds will be spent first? Only one city responded yes, and only one city responded somewhat.</p>	<p>3.6 % Yes 92.8 % No 3.6 % Somewhat</p>																
<p>Have the reporting requirements for ARRA caused serious problems?</p>	<p>6.3 % Yes 53.6 % No 39.3 % Somewhat</p>																
<p>Are you seeing more people come into the one-stop centers since receiving ARRA funds? (Adults)</p>	<p>93 % Yes 7 % No 46.3 % Average Increase</p>																
<p>Are you able to serve all of them?</p>	<p>65 % Yes 35 % No</p>																
<p>Are you seeing more people come into the one-stop centers since receiving ARRA funds? (Dislocated Workers)</p>	<p>88 % Yes 22 % No 50 % Average Increase</p>																
<p>Are you able to serve all of them?</p>	<p>73 % Yes 27 % No</p>																
<p>Are you able to serve all Youth who want a job this summer? Only 2 cities responded yes On Average, 40% of Youth Applied received Jobs</p>	<p>7 % Yes 93 % No 7,421 (On average) applied 2,362 (On average) received jobs</p>																
<p>Are you serving Hard-to-Serve populations with your ARRA funds?</p>	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td>Drop-outs</td> <td style="text-align: right;">100 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Older Youth</td> <td style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ex-Offenders</td> <td style="text-align: right;">89%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Homeless</td> <td style="text-align: right;">78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Long-term Unemployed</td> <td style="text-align: right;">82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In need of ESL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Single Parents</td> <td style="text-align: right;">96%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td style="text-align: right;">33%</td> </tr> </table>	Drop-outs	100 %	Older Youth	100%	Ex-Offenders	89%	Homeless	78%	Long-term Unemployed	82%	In need of ESL	70%	Single Parents	96%	Other	33%
Drop-outs	100 %																
Older Youth	100%																
Ex-Offenders	89%																
Homeless	78%																
Long-term Unemployed	82%																
In need of ESL	70%																
Single Parents	96%																
Other	33%																

### **ARRA Summer Youth Funding**

Are there any things that you feel need to be changed if there is another reiteration of a Summer Jobs program? Please include legislative, technical, etc.	96% Yes (See pg.xx)
---	------------------------

### **ARRA Adult Funding**

Are there any issues that you feel need to be addressed for Adult funding? Please identify any problems that you have had in spending the funds.	18.4 % had issues they felt need to be addressed 3.7 % identified problems in spending
Are you able to put more clients into training with ARRA funding?	100% Yes
Are you able to provide any needs-related payments to clients in training?	58% Yes

### **Dislocated Worker Funding**

Are there any things that you would like to see changed in Dislocated Worker funding? Please identify any problems that you have had in spending these funds.	30% had things they want to see changed (or problems in spending)
Are you able to put more clients into training with ARRA funding?	100% Yes
Are you able to provide needs-related payments to clients in training?	58% Yes

### **Beyond DOL**

Are you working with either the Department of Energy or the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to fund Community Action Agencies to provide training for Weatherization?	58% Yes
---	---------