



**CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

MEETING NOTICE

**Wednesday, November 4, 2015
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

Tim Rainey
Executive Director

Michael Rossi
Chair

**California Workforce Development Board
800 Capitol Mall, Suite 1022
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 657-1440**



Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor

**Alternate Location
Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy
385 Homer Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301**

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

2. Public Comment

3. Action Items

- a. Approve the Meeting Summary from September 1, 2015
- b. Approve WIOA Regional Planning Areas

4. Updates and Discussion

- a. SlingShot - update
- b. WIOA State Strategic Plan – Process for Public Input
- c. Increasing Skills and Credentials Workgroup – update
- d. Board of Governors – Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation and a Strong Economy

5. Other Business

Meeting conclusion time is an estimate; meeting may end earlier subject to completion of agenda items and/or approved motion to adjourn. In order for the State Board to provide an opportunity for interested parties to speak at the public meetings, public comment may be limited. Written comments provided to the Committee must be made available to the public, in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, §11125.1, with copies available in sufficient supply. Individuals who require accommodations for their disabilities (including interpreters and alternate formats) are requested to contact the California Workforce Investment Board staff at (916) 657-1440 at least ten days prior to the meeting. TTY line: (916) 324-6523. Please visit the California Workforce Development Board website at <http://www.cwdb.ca.gov> or contact Daniel Patterson (916) 657-1446 for additional information. Meeting materials for the public will be available at the meeting location.

Item 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Item 2. Public Comment

Item 3. Action Items

- a. Approve the September 1, 2015 Meeting Summary**
- b. Approve the Identification of California's Regional Planning Unit Areas**

The WIOA requires the Governor to identify regional planning units within the state. This action taken by the Board will enable a decision by the Governor.

**CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 1, 2015**

MEETING SUMMARY

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Chair Rossi welcomed the members, opened the meeting and covered the agenda items.
Tim introduced Sarah White and her role at the State Board.

Members Present:

Mike Rossi, Chair	John Brauer
Tim Rainey, Executive Director	Patrick Henning, Jr.
Brian McMahon for Secretary Lanier	Bob Redlo
Steve Levy	Pamela Kan
Jeremy Smith	Carol Zabin

Members Absent:

Cindy Chavez	Richard Rubin
Bill Camp	Dr. Brice Harris

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment

3. Action Items:

a. Approve the June 1, 2015 Meeting Summary

A motion was given by Patrick Henning, Jr. to approve the meeting summary, a second by John Brauer. All voted unanimously in favor.

b. Approve Appeal Process on Denial of Initial Designation

i. Appeal from San Bernardino City on Denial of Application for Initial Designation

ii. Appoint neutral hearing officer

iii. Delegation of authority to the Chair and Labor Secretary

Tim Rainey provided an overview of the action item.

**CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 1, 2015**

MEETING SUMMARY

The Committee was asked to act on behalf of the full Board, exercising the Executive Committee's authority under the Bylaws, to ensure an expedited appeal process.

In discussing the action recommended for San Bernardino City, the members expressed concern regarding the availability of services to job seekers and how this action is impacting them. Mr. Henning stated that the City has been on a cash-hold since October 2014 but the City has provided local General Funds to their employment and training agency through the end of September 2015. There are also efforts by the local board of San Bernardino County to provide services to the city's residents. The members asked to be briefed on the results of local negotiations to ensure the continuity of services to the job seekers in the city of San Bernardino.

A motion was given by Patrick Henning, Jr. to approve the recommendation as presented; a second by John Brauer. All voted unanimously in favor.

4. Updates and Discussion:

No other updates or discussion provided in agenda packet.

5. Other Business

John Brauer asked what the agenda will be for the upcoming State Board meeting. At this time it will include updates on State Board WIOA Implementation efforts and SlingShot initiative. There was no further discussion. Jeremy Smith motioned to adjourn; seconded by Pamela Kan. The meeting was adjourned.

Action Requested

Approve WIOA Regional Planning Units.

Background

Sec. 106 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) requires states to identify regions for the purpose of regional planning. These areas must be included in the Governor's Unified State Workforce Plan due to the US Department of Labor in March 2016. Regional and local plans are due to the State in March 2017.

[Draft Directive WSDD-116](#) was published on April 30, 2015 with a due date for public comments of May 29, 2015. The directive communicated the State's analysis, rationale and methodology for identification of Regional Planning Units (RPU). The State received and considered public comment. The final recommendations are included in the attached directive.

Chronology of activities in developing the WIOA Regional Planning Units:

December 2014 – State Board and EDD/LMID staff attended the quarterly Director's meeting of the California Workforce Association (CWA) and discussed the criteria to be used to determine the Regional Planning Units.

January 2015 - CWA submitted a proposed regional map to the State Board, and in March 2015 CWA met Board and LWDA staff to discuss the proposed boundaries of the regional planning areas.

March 24, 2015 - Secretary David Lanier and Chair Mike Rossi reviewed the proposed map boundaries and the methodology used for the Regional Planning Units.

March 25, 2015 - CWA was provided a draft map and description of the methodology used to develop the proposed Regional Planning Units.

April 17, 2015 - Proposed map and methodology were reviewed with the CWA Executive Committee. CWA requested a formal directive and public comment process and direct notification to the Chief Local Elected Officials of the local workforce areas.

April 21, 2015 – WIOA Implementation Working Group reviewed the map methodology and proposed boundaries for the Regional Planning Units.

April 30, 2015 - Draft Directive WSDD-116 was published with a due date for comments of May 29, 2015.

April 30, 2015 – Letters sent notifying the Chief Local Elected Officials of the WIOA requirement for identifying Regional Planning Units. The letter included the proposed map.

May 20, 2015 – Each local workforce board director was emailed a copy of the letter mailed to the corresponding Chief Local Elected Official.

June 1, 2015 – State Board Executive Committee reviewed and discussed public input and considered proposed changes to the map boundaries for the Regional Planning Units.

June 23, 2015 – At its quarterly meeting, the Workforce Development Board reviewed, discussed, and heard public comment on the map methodology and proposed Regional Planning Units.

July 2, 2015 – WIOA Implementation Working Group reviewed the proposed boundaries for the Regional Planning Units.

September 9, 2015 – Regional Planning Units presented to the CWA's fall conference in Monterey

Policy Criteria

Following the public comment period for Directive WSDD-116, staff concurred with two proposed changes to the initial Regional Planning Unit boundaries: move Mendocino County into a the 6 county North Bay region that is currently engaged in regional planning efforts; and move San Benito County to the Bay Peninsula RPU. These changes were supported by data which reflected commuter patterns and employment opportunities. The final directive, list of RPUs, Summary of Comments and methodology are included as attachments.

Next Steps

The Regional Planning Units to be presented to the full State Board for approval at its December 1, 2015 meeting. The Governor will take final action.

WIOA Regional Planning Units



Regional Planning Units

1. **Coastal Region** (4 boards): Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz

Counties Included (4): Monterey, Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo

Major City Populations in Region: Salinas, Santa Maria, Santa Barbara, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz

2. **Middle Sierra** (1 board): Mother Lode

Counties Included (4): Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa, Tuolumne

Major City Populations in Region: Sonora, Angels City

3. **North Coast** (1 Board): Humboldt

Counties Included (1): Humboldt

Major City Populations in Region: Eureka

4. **North State** (1 board): NORTEC

Counties Included (11): Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Trinity, Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Nevada, Sierra, Plumas, Lassen

Major City Populations in Region: Redding, Chico, Paradise, Oroville, Truckee, Susanville

5. **Capitol Region** (4 boards): Golden Sierra, North Central Counties, SETA , Yolo

Counties Included (9): Alpine, Sacramento, Yolo, Sutter, Colusa, Glenn, Yuba, Placer, El Dorado

Major City Populations in Region: Sacramento, Elk Grove, Roseville

6. **East Bay** (4 boards): Contra Costa County, Alameda, Richmond, Oakland

Counties Included (2): Contra Costa, Alameda

Major City Populations in Region: Oakland, Fremont, Concord, Berkeley, Richmond, Antioch

7. **North Bay** (5 boards): Marin, Napa-Lake, Sonoma, Solano, **Mendocino**

Counties Included (6): Marin, Napa, Lake, Sonoma, Solano, and Mendocino

Major City Populations in Region: Santa Rosa, Vallejo, Fairfield, San Rafael, Napa, Ukiah

8. **Bay-Peninsula** (5 boards): San Francisco, NOVA, San Mateo, San Jose, **San Benito**

Counties Included (4): San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, San Benito

Major City Populations in Region: San Jose, San Francisco, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Daly City, San Mateo, Palo Alto

9. **San Joaquin Valley and Associated Counties** (8 Boards): Fresno, Kern-Inyo-Mono, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tulare

Counties Included (10): Fresno, Kern, Inyo, Mono, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tulare

Major City Populations in Region: Fresno, Bakersfield, Stockton, Modesto, Visalia, Clovis, Merced

10. **Southern Border** (2 Boards): San Diego, Imperial

Counties Included (2): San Diego, Imperial

Major City Populations in Region: San Diego, Chula Vista, Oceanside, Escondido, Carlsbad, El Cajon

11. **Los Angeles Basin** (7 Boards): Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Foothill, Southeast Los Angeles County, South Bay, Verdugo, Pacific Gateway

Counties Included (1): Los Angeles

Major City Populations in Region: Los Angeles, Long Beach, Santa Clarita, Glendale, Lancaster, Palmdale, Pomona, Torrance, Pasadena, El Monte, Downey, Inglewood, West Covina, Norwalk, Burbank, Carson, Compton, Santa Monica,

12. **Orange** (3 Boards): Santa Ana, Orange, Anaheim

Counties Included (1): Orange

Major City Populations in Region: Anaheim, Santa Ana, Irvine, Huntington Beach, Garden Grove, Orange, Fullerton, Costa Mesa, Mission Viejo

13. Inland Empire (2 or 3 Boards): Riverside, San Bernardino County, and possibly San Bernardino City

Counties Included (2): Riverside, San Bernardino

Major City Populations in Region: Riverside, San Bernardino, Fontana, Moreno Valley, Rancho Cucamonga, Ontario, Corona, Victorville, Murrieta, Temecula, Rialto

14. Ventura (1 Board)

Counties Included (1): Ventura

Major City Populations in Region: Oxnard, Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, San Buenaventura

LMID Economic Regions and Subregions for Regional Economic Analysis Profiles



Counties in Numbered Subregions:

Northern Region

1. Butte, Colusa, and Glenn
2. Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity
3. Del Norte, Humboldt, and Mendocino

Sacramento Region

4. Alpine, El Dorado, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo
5. Sutter and Yuba

San Francisco Bay Area Region

6. Alameda, Contra Costa, and Solano
7. Lake, Napa, and Sonoma
8. Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara

San Joaquin Valley Region

9. San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Merced
10. Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, and Tulare

Eastern Sierra Region

11. Amador, Calaveras, Inyo, Mono, Mariposa, and Tuolumne

Coastal Region

12. Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito
13. Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo

Southern Region

14. Los Angeles
15. Orange
16. San Bernardino and Riverside
17. Ventura

Southern Border Region

18. San Diego
19. Imperial

How the regions were initially determined (Summary)

Local board placement in **regional planning units** is based primarily on economic data, the location of WIOA client populations, the way these populations fit into regional economies, commute patterns between counties, and the geographic distribution of industry sectors.

While the boundaries of the proposed **regional planning units** were largely set by giving weight to the foregoing economic data and by starting with **regional economic market** boundaries drawn by EDD, proposed regional planning unit boundaries were modified to take into account the number of local workforce investment areas in a region, the size of the area covered, and the boundaries and planning relations of existing regional workforce consortia. Additionally the CWDB took into account the location of regional consortia providing Adult Education services, and economic development areas when drawing these boundaries.

EDD's Method to Draw Regional Economic Market Boundaries

1. EDD LMID started by dividing California into regions based on geography and transportation infrastructure.
2. EDD LMID used commute pattern data (U.S. Census Bureau) and industry employment data (EDD-LMID) to identify the largest employment center in each region (as measured by the number of jobs in a county and the number of people entering the county from elsewhere for employment).
3. EDD LMID used commute pattern data (U.S. Census Bureau) to identify whether surrounding counties within a region were attached to the "largest employment center" county as measured by commute patterns.
4. For counties without a clear region designation as based on the steps above, EDD LMID used labor market (EDD-LMID) and industry employment (EDD-LMID) data to evaluate the labor market size and industry composition of a county. EDD LMID then used this analysis to place counties in regional markets based on whether or not the county's labor market was similar in size to the regional market and/or whether it had a similar industry footprint.
5. Using the foregoing methodology EDD arrived at 8 macro-regional markets and 19 sub-regional economic markets.

Principles CWIB Used to Initially Modify Market Boundaries and Draw Planning Unit Boundaries

- Local Workforce Boards will only be required to plan in one regional planning unit.
- Boards will always plan in the macro-regional economic markets where the majority of their populations are located.
- Regional planning units respect the existing administrative boundaries of Counties and Local Workforce Investment Boards.

- Regional planning boundaries provide some deference to existing planning relationships provided that boards plan inside the macro-regional economic market where the majority of their populations reside.
- Regional planning units carved out of larger regional economic markets correspond, as much as possible, with the boundaries of sub-regional economic markets.

Other Considerations

- Regional planning unit boundaries are typically consistent with or nested inside the historical economic development area boundaries determined by California's defunct Economic Strategy Panel.
- An examination of the location and number of Adult Education providers in the Adult Education consortia was undertaken to ensure that there were a sufficient number of providers in each regional planning unit.
- The boundaries were modified following public comment.

How the regions were initially determined **(Detailed Consideration)**

Local board placement in **regional planning units** is based primarily on economic data, the location of WIOA client populations, the way these populations fit into regional economies, commute patterns between counties, and the geographic distribution of industry sectors.

While the boundaries of the proposed **regional planning units** were largely set by giving weight to the foregoing economic data and by starting with **regional economic market** boundaries drawn by EDD, proposed regional planning unit boundaries were modified to take into account the number of local workforce investment areas in a region, the size of the area covered, and the boundaries and planning relations of existing regional workforce consortia.

Initial Considerations

Initial examination of relevant economic data led to the identification of regional economic markets by EDD's Labor Market Information Division. They used the following methodology:

1. EDD LMID started by dividing California into regions based on geography and transportation infrastructure.
2. EDD LMID used commute pattern data (U.S. Census Bureau) and industry employment data (EDD-LMID) to identify the largest employment center in each region (as measured by the number of jobs in a county and the number of people entering the county from elsewhere for employment).
3. EDD LMID used commute pattern data (U.S. Census Bureau) to identify whether surrounding counties within a region were attached to the "largest employment center" county as measured by commute patterns.
4. For counties without a clear region designation as based on the steps above, EDD LMID used labor market (EDD-LMID) and industry employment (EDD-LMID) data to evaluate the labor market size and industry composition of a county. EDD LMID then used this analysis to place counties in regional markets based on whether or not the county's labor market was similar in size to the regional market and/or whether it had a similar industry footprint.
5. Using the foregoing methodology EDD arrived at 8 macro-regional markets and 19 sub-regional economic markets.

How LMID Boundaries were Modified

Simplicity. Some Local Workforce Investment Boards straddle the eight macro-regional economic markets identified by EDD LMID. To keep things simple, boards are only placed in one regional economic market and only required to plan in a single regional planning unit.

- Local Workforce Boards will only be required to plan in one regional planning unit.

Client Needs. Keeping in mind the needs of the jobseeker, boards were initially required to plan in regional planning units tied to the macro-regional economic markets where the majority of the populations they serve were located.

Practicality. Some macro-regional economic markets are too big, or contain too many local workforce investment boards to function practically as regional planning units. In these instances regional planning units were carved out of economic markets using three principles:

- Regional planning units respect the existing administrative boundaries of Counties and Local Workforce Investment Boards.
- Regional planning boundaries provide some deference to existing planning relationships provided that boards plan inside the macro-regional economic market where the majority of their populations reside.
- Regional planning units carved out of larger regional economic markets correspond, as much as possible, with the boundaries of sub-regional economic markets.

Regional planning units' primary purpose is to provide coordinated service delivery to both industry and job seekers who enter employment relations within a given labor market. Accordingly, boards should plan and coordinate service delivery regionally on the basis of shared labor market dynamics. Doing so requires that the state keep regional planning units boundaries in alignment, as much as is practically possible, with the location of the regional economic markets where their populations reside.

Other Considerations

- Regional planning unit boundaries are typically consistent with or nested inside the historical economic development area boundaries determined by California's defunct Economic Strategy Panel.
- An examination of the location and number of Adult Education providers in the Adult Education consortia was undertaken to ensure that there were a sufficient number of providers in each regional planning unit.
- The boundaries were modified following public comment.

Why is my board assigned to its regional planning unit?

Coastal Region (Initially included 5 boards, but now includes 4 boards): Monterey, SLO, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz. This regional planning unit brought together all the boards inside the Coastal regional economic market, but was modified, after public comment, to move San Benito into the Bay Peninsula RPU at the request of San Benito because of the relationship between San Benito and community colleges in southern Santa Clara County

Middle Sierra (1 board): Mother Lode. This regional planning unit contains one board, Mother Lode, which is the only board whose boundaries are wholly contained inside the EDD's Eastern Sierra macro-regional economic market. Moreover, Mother Lode is the only board that serves a client base whose majority population lives within this region and already functions as a regional planning consortium that serves multiple counties.

Humboldt (1Boards): Humboldt. EDD's Northern regional economic market is too geographically vast to function as a regional planning unit and was split into two regional planning units. This regional planning unit originally contained the boards that served Humboldt and Mendocino counties, and the boundaries were largely contiguous with the borders of the relevant sub-regional economic market. While Mendocino was originally grouped with Humboldt it was moved to the North Bay region following public comment as a result of its existing planning relationship with the boards that make up the North Bay regional planning unit..

North State (1 board): NORTEC. This is the other regional planning unit carved out of the Northern regional economic market and is largely contiguous with the boundaries of the relevant sub-regional economic market. The board in this regional planning area, NORTEC, already functions as a regional planning consortium and serves multiple counties.

Capitol Region (4 boards): Golden Sierra, North Central Counties Consortium, SETA , Yolo. This regional planning unit brings together all the boards inside the Sacramento regional economic market, including North Central Counties Consortium, a local board that straddles the Northern regional economic market and the Sacramento regional economic market. Because most of NCCC's population resides in the Sacramento regional economic market, NCCC is assigned to this regional planning unit.

East Bay (4 boards): COCO, Alameda, Richmond, Oakland. EDD's Bay Area regional economic market contains too many boards to function as a regional planning unit and was split into three regional planning units of four boards apiece. The East Bay regional planning unit contains 4 of the 5 boards located in the Alameda-Contra Costa-Solano sub-regional economic market, omitting Solano which has an existing planning relationship with the boards contained in the North Bay regional planning unit.

North Bay (5 boards): Marin, Napa-Lake, Sonoma, Solano, Mendocino. This is the second regional planning unit carved out of EDD's Bay Area regional economic market. It contains all the boards in the Napa, Lake, Sonoma sub-regional economic market and adds-in both the Solano and Marin boards, as both have an existing regional planning relationship with the Napa-Lake and Sonoma boards. It also includes the Mendocino board, which also has an existing planning relationship with the other boards. Mendocino was added following public comment.

Bay-Peninsula (4 boards): SF, NOVA, San Jose, San Benito. This is the third regional planning unit carved out of EDD's Bay Area regional economic market. This regional planning unit contains all the boards remaining in the Bay Area and is largely contiguous with the third and remaining sub-regional economic market contained inside the Bay Area regional economic market. It also includes San Benito, which was added following public comment, as a result of San Benito's relationship with Community Colleges in southern Santa Clara County.

San Joaquin Valley and Associated Counties (8 Boards): Fresno, Kern-Inyo-Mono, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tulare. This regional planning unit contains all the boards inside the San Joaquin Valley, including the Kern-Inyo-Mono board, whose area straddles two macro-regional economic markets. The Kern-Inyo-Mono board was grouped with the San Joaquin Valley regional planning unit because the majority of the population it serves resides in Kern County which is in the San Joaquin Valley macro-regional economic market.

Southern Border (2 Boards): San Diego, Imperial. This regional planning unit contains both of the boards operating inside the Southern Border macro-regional economic market.

Los Angeles Basin (7 Boards): LA City, LA County, Foothill, SELACO, South Bay, Verdugo, Pacific Gateway. EDD's Southern macro-regional economic market contains too many boards to work as a regional planning unit and was split into four regional planning units using county and sub-regional economic market boundaries. The LA Basin planning unit contains all the boards that operate in LA County and is wholly contiguous with the sub-regional economic market.

Orange (3 Boards): Santa Ana, Orange, Anaheim. The Orange regional planning unit contains all the boards that operate in Orange County and the planning unit is wholly contiguous with the relevant sub-regional economic market.

Inland Empire (2 or 3 Boards): Riverside, San Bernardino County, and San Bernardino City, if this board is designated under WIOA. The Inland Empire regional planning unit will contain all the boards operating in Riverside and San Bernardino counties and will be contiguous with the relevant sub-regional economic market.

Ventura (1 Board): The Ventura regional planning unit contains one board, but it is contiguous with the relevant sub-regional economic market, and in this regard it is like all other regional planning units carved out of the Southern regional economic market.

Summary of Comments

Draft Directive Identification of WIOA Regional Planning Units

There were twenty eight (28) comments received in response to the draft directive. Many of the comments expressed similar concerns or questions, and where practicable were consolidated for the purposes of this summary. In addition, numerous comments received supported the regional maps and boundaries as they were drawn. Where the comments resulted in a change to the initial boundaries, the maps and supporting documents were amended to effect those changes.

Comment #1 stated that the public comment period did not allow sufficient time for local boards to consult with their chief local elected officials (CLEO) and/or Board of Supervisors or City Councils. There was also similar concerns raised that draft directives requiring coordination with CLEOS should allow up to 60 days of public comment as a standard practice versus the 30 day period currently being used.

Response: In advance of the publication of the Draft Directive and in addition to the public noticed meetings of the State Board and its committees, extensive outreach was conducted and received valuable input from the California Workforce Association, the League of Cities and the California State Association of Counties and state workforce partner agencies. The majority of State policy guidance is developed in collaboration with a wide breadth of state and local partners and completed well in advance of these new policies being available for public comment. In addition to the 30-day public comment period for draft policies, there is an additional comment period once the policy is published as a final product. It is our opinion that sufficient time is provided. However, in the future additional time may be considered to allow Local Workforce Development Boards additional opportunity to consult with the CLEOs and the other entities of local government as necessary.

Comment #2 asked why the granular data used by the State to draw boundaries and economic regions and sub-regions was not provided for public review.

Response: the public comment period was to encourage local areas to provide feedback on the methodology and the conclusions reached by the State Board. We were also interested in receiving input on alternative methodologies and/or conclusions using other data sets that might indicate the need to adjust the proposed regional planning unit boundaries. Some local areas were able to provide additional data that had not been previously considered by the State Board and did result in a change of the initial proposed boundaries.

Comment #3 requested to remove Mendocino County from the North Coast Planning Unit and assign the County to the North Bay Planning Unit.

Response: Documentation supporting this amendment was received as well as support for the request from several of the local boards identified as part of the North Bay Planning Unit. After

review of the data and consultation with the requestor, changes have been made to the Regional Planning Map.

Comment #4 requested to remove San Benito from the Coastal Planning Unit and reassign them to the Bay Peninsula Planning Unit.

Response: Documentation supporting this amendment was received from the commenter. After review of the data and consultation with the commenter, changes have been made to the Regional Planning Map.

Comment #5 recommended the consolidation of the North Bay and North Coast regions into one region.

The Directive WSD116 included both a methodology and principles used to draw the proposed regional boundaries. The commenter did provide data and rationale for this request. However, a number of Local Boards in the North Bay region indicated opposition to the consolidation, indicating a preference to only include Mendocino in the RPU. After further consideration Humboldt withdrew its request to be included in the RPU.

Comment #6 recommended the boundaries for the Coastal Region be redrawn to include only the Santa Barbara County, Ventura County and San Luis Obispo County. The comments supporting this included the large travel distances within the region; lack of public transportation systems connecting these counties and how existing workforce partners define the Tri-Counties area as a region.

Response: The State Board was very deliberate in applying the methodology and principles to the drawing of the proposed regional planning units. We received comment supporting Ventura County planning area as it is currently drawn and support for Monterey in the Coastal Region as it is drawn. Additionally, in alignment with this comment, San Benito County has requested and will be relocated from the Coastal Region to the Bay Area Planning Region. See Comment #4 above. No additional changes will be made to the Coastal Region Planning Unit geographical boundaries.

Comment #7 suggested that where practical, regional planning not be constricted to the boundaries as they are drawn, but where there are opportunities to engage in a wider more robust effort and take greater advantage of economies of scale if it spans multiple RPU boundaries.

We agree and support larger planning efforts in instances where a particular sector may cross regional planning unit boundaries that local boards share the planning to have larger regional impacts and coordination.

Item 4. Discussion/Updates

- a. **SlingShot – update**
- b. **WIOA State Strategic Plan – Process for Public Input**
- c. **Increasing Skills and Credential Workgroup – update**
- d. **Board of Governors- Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation and a Strong Economy**

Item 5. Other Business