

TEGL 02-97, Change 1 Attachment F2

STATE PLAN FOR AGRICULTURE SERVICES

I. Summary of State Plan Requirements. Each State agency, in its State Plan, shall describe the activities planned for providing services to the agricultural community, both agricultural employers and Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers (MSFWs). The plan shall contain the following:

A. Assessment of need. (See Part II)

All States shall prepare a comprehensive assessment of need plan in accordance with Federal requirements at 20 CFR Part 653.

B. Outreach Plan. (See Part III)

All States shall prepare a comprehensive outreach plan in accordance with requirements at 20 CFR 653.107.

C. ES Services Provided to MSFWs. (See Part IV)

All States are to plan to meet at least the minimum requirements for providing services to MSFWs. All States are required to meet at least four of the five equity indicators. 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 the steps planned to meet the performance indicators.

D. ES Services Provided to Agricultural Employers.
(See Part V)

All States are required to describe efforts planned in providing ES services to agricultural employers in both those States with an adequate supply of U.S. workers and those where the supply appears to be inadequate.

E. Other Plan Requirements

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 the agricultural 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 653.109(t), in the preparation of this plan.

3. Affirmative Action Plan Review/Comments.

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.

States with designated Significant Affirmative Action Local Offices are required to submit an Affirmative Action Plan in accordance with 20 CFR 653.111.

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

All States are to provide information indicating that 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 plan.

II. Assessment of need. This assessment of need shall take into account data supplied by JTPA 402 grantees, MSFW organizations, employer organizations, Federal/State Agencies, Migrant Education agency, etc. This assessment of need shall include:

- A. A review of the previous year's agricultural activity in the State.
 - Identify each major labor intensive crop activity in the previous year, indicating the months of heavy activity and the geographic area of prime activity.
- B. A review of the previous year's MSFW activity in the State.
 - Estimate the agricultural labor employed in each of the crops identified in item II.A. Estimate the number of MSFWs involved in each, and indicate crop areas which experienced labor shortages.
- C. A projected level of agricultural activity expected in the State in the coming year.
 - Identify any changes from last year's crop activities as described in item II.A
- D. A projected number of MSFWs in the State in the coming year.
 - Identify any changes in the numbers of MSFWs involved in each crop activity as described in item II.A.

III. Outreach Plan. Each State shall prepare a comprehensive outreach plan in accordance with Federal 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, and the need for outreach services in the State.

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. The designations for PY 1999 are provided in Table 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 State adequately addressing the following features of the Outreach Plan:

- 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. The significant MSFW local offices listed in Table 4 should assign full-time staff for outreach duties 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 anticipated results of the outreach efforts to be provided in item A. These goals shall include:
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). Also, describe any coordinated plans and activities with other agencies where possible surplus of workers may exist.

IV. ES Services Provided to MSFWs.

A. Plan Data for the Upcoming Year.

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

- a. A description of the problems;
- b. Specific steps planned to meet minimum service levels; and
- c. 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 3. These standards are set to encourage appropriate service to MSFWs and to assure the continuation of such services. The minimum service levels are established annually.

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:

- Ratio of non-MSFWs to MSFWs referred to jobs.
- Ratio of non-MSFWs to MSFWs for whom service is provided.
- Ratio of non-MSFWs to MSFWs referred to supportive services.
- Ratio of non-MSFWs to MSFWs counseled.
- 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 1998 of Affirmative Plan offices are provided in Table 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.

V. ES Services Provided to Agricultural Employers.

A. Data Analysis

1. Previous year's history (based on PY 98 actual data):

- a. Number of agricultural job orders and openings received
- b. Number of agricultural job orders filled
- c. Percent filled $[(b/a) \times 100]$
- d. Number of interstate clearance orders received
- e. Number of interstate clearance orders initiated

2. Plan for upcoming year (based on estimated data).

- a. Number of agricultural job orders expected to be received
- b. Number of agricultural job orders projected to be filled
- c. Percent 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

All States shall provide a description of their efforts in providing ES services to agricultural employers, including both

those with an adequate supply of U.S. workers and those where the supply may be inadequate. These efforts should include:

- A description of how the State agency plans to provide ES services to agricultural employers.
- A description of the process used to identify agricultural employers expected to utilize MSFWs.
- A description of the process for linking available workers with the employers, including the cooperation with or the creation of coordinating bodies to assure programs are coordinated and to insure programs respond to local needs. These coordinating groups may consist of organizations such as the Employment Service, 402 grantees, agricultural employers, migrant education groups, migrant health groups, etc.
- Describe the process of how the State will promote ES services available to agricultural employers, e.g., participation in employer conferences, development of marketing tools, labor exchange information to employers, recruitment of U.S. workers, etc.
- Where an H-2A program operated in the State in the previous year, explain efforts to increase U.S. worker participation.

VI. Enclosures to State Plan for Agricultural Services:

Table 1. Significant MSFW States for PY 1999

Table 2. Affirmative Action Plan Significant MSFW Local Offices

Table 3. Minimum Service Level Indicators for PY 1999

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

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

SIGNIFICANT MSFW STATES FOR PY 1999

	<u>State</u>	<u>MSFW Applicants</u>
1.	California	33,656
2.	Texas	31,239
3.	Florida	20,664
4.	Washington	17,379
5.	North Carolina	13,359
6.	Michigan	12,785
7.	Arizona	9,007
8.	Puerto Rico	7,870
9.	Georgia	7,071
10.	Oregon	5,404
11.	South Carolina	4,247
12.	Virginia	3,457
13.	Minnesota	2,612
14.	Idaho	2,379
15.	New Mexico	2,283
16.	Ohio	2,128
17.	New York	1,883
18.	Pennsylvania	850
19.	Illinois	813
20.	Wisconsin	729

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN SIGNIFICANT MSFW LOCAL OFFICES
(TOP 20% OF MSFW ACTIVITY NATIONWIDE)

<u>Local Office</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>MSFW Applications</u>
McAllen, TX	VI	7,159
Weslaco, TX	VI	6,210
Edinburg, TX	VI	5,984
Eagle Pass, TX	VI	3,630
Brownsville, TX	VI	2,602
Sunnyside, WA	X	3,480
Yakima, WA	X	2,929
Moses Lake, WA	X	2,748
Wanatchee, WA	X	<u>2,593</u>
Total MSFW Applications:		37,335

Federal regulations at 20 CFR 653.111 (b)(1) requires that "Affirmative Action Plan" local offices be designated each year. For purposes of this provision, these local offices mean those representing the top 20% of MSFW activity nationally.

Total MSFW applications nationwide in PY 98 = 188,655

$188,655 \times 20\% = 37,773$

MINIMUM SERVICE INDICATOR LEVELS FOR PY 1999

In accordance with federal regulations at 20 CFR 653.112, the following are the services and minimum levels that Significant MSFW States are to meet on providing services to MSFWs:

- (1) Individuals placed in a job;
- (2) Individuals placed in a job with a wage exceeding the federal minimum wage by at least 50 cents/hour;
- (3) Placed in long-term (over 150 days) non-agricultural jobs;

<u>State</u>	<u>(1)</u> <u>MSFW</u> <u>Placed %</u>	<u>(2)</u> <u>Placed \$.50</u> <u>Above Federal</u> <u>Minimum Wage</u>	<u>(3)</u> <u>Placed in</u> <u>Long-term</u> <u>Non-Ag Job</u>
California	42.5	14.0%	4.9%
Texas	42.5	14.0	8.2
Florida	42.5	14.0	6.0
Washington	42.5	14.0	3.3
North Carolina	42.5	14.0	5.0
Michigan	42.5	14.0	3.8
Arizona	42.5	14.0	3.8
Puerto Rico	42.5	12.0	4.2
Georgia	42.5	9.0	3.0
Oregon	42.5	14.0	6.2
Indiana	42.5	14.0	
South Carolina	42.5	14.0	3.9
Virginia	42.5	14.0	5.2
Minnesota	42.5	14.0	4.3
Idaho	42.5	14.0	7.3
New Mexico	42.5	14.0	3.0
Ohio	42.5	4.0	4.0
New York	42.5	14.0	6.5
Wisconsin	42.5	14.0	3.3
North Dakota	42.5	14.0	4.5

- (4) Review of significant MSFW local offices: 100% for all Significant States

The determination for the following were established by the States commencing with PY 1996:

- (5) Field checks on agricultural clearance orders;
- (6) Outreach contacts per staff day; and
- (7) Processing of complaints.

Significant MSFW Local Offices and Bilingual Offices by Region for PY 1999

<u>REGION I</u>	West Virginia	South Carolina
None	Martinsburg	Aiken
		Beaufort
		Charleston
<u>REGION II</u>	<u>REGION IV</u>	Spartanburg
Puerto Rico	Florida	Sumter
Aguadilla	Apopka	
Arecibo/Manati	Apollo Beach	<u>REGION V</u>
Caguas	Belle Glade	Illinois
Guayama	Bradenton	Danville
Humacao	Fort Pierce	Kankakee
Mayaguez/San German	Homestead	Murphysboro
Ponce/Coamo	Immokalee	Peoria
Bayamon	Naples	
Rio Pinenros	Plant City	Michigan
Yancio	Quincy	Sidney
	Sebring	
New York	Wauchula	Minnesota
Albion/Elba	Winterhaven	Crookston
Hudson		East Grand Forks
Kingston	Georgia	Fergus Falls
Lockport	Americus	Moorhead
Pine Island	Bainbridge	Owatonna
Newark	Cordele	Willmar
Riverhead	Douglas	
	Moultrie	Wisconsin
New Jersey	Vidalia	Beaver Dam
Hammonton	Statesboro	Wautoma
Vineline/Bridgeton		
	North Carolina	<u>REGION VI</u>
<u>REGION III</u>	Clinton	New Mexico
Delaware	Dunn	Deming
Dover	Elizabethtown	Las Cruces
	Greenville	
Maryland	Hendersonville	
Crisfield	Kenansville	
	Mt. Olive	
Virginia	Washington	
Exmore	Wilson	
Winchester	Smithfield	

REGION VI (Con't)**Texas**

Brownsville
 Canutillo
 Carrizo Springs
 Crystal City
 Del Rio
 Eagle Pass
 Edinburg
 Fabens
 Floydada
 Harlingen
 Hereford
 Laredo
 Lamesa
 McAllen
 Muleshoe
 Pecos
 Plainview
 Raymondville
 Rio Grande City
 Uvalde
 Weslaco

REGION VII**None****REGION VIII****Colorado**

Brighton
 Delta
 Greeley
 Lamar
 Monte Vista
 Rocky Ford

North Dakota

Grafton

Utah

Brigham City

Montana

Sidney

REGION IX**Arizona**

Coolidge
 Douglas
 Wilcox
 Yuma
 Maryvale
 Mesa

California

Bakesfield
 Blythe
 Chico
 Colusa
 Delano
 El Centro
 Fresno (West)
 Gilroy
 Hanford
 Hollister
 Huron
 Indio
 Lakeport
 Lamont
 Lodi
 Los Banos
 Madera
 Manteca
 Marysville
 Mendota
 Merced
 Modesto
 Oxnard
 Porterville
 Salinas
 Sanger
 Santa Maria
 Turlock

Ukia

California (Con't)

Visalia
 Wasco
 Watsonville
 Woodland

REGION X**Idaho**

Burley
 Canyon County
 Magic Valley
 Emmett
 Payette
 Rexburg

Oregon

Hood River
 Madras
 Milton-Freewater
 Woodburn

Washington

Bellingham
 Columbia Gorge
 Moses Lake
 Mount Vernon
 Okanogan
 Sunnyside
 Tri-Cities
 Walla Walla
 Wanatchee
 Yakima

STATES WITH HIGHEST ESTIMATED MSFW ACTIVITY

The following are the five States with the highest year-round MSFW activity:

California
Florida
North Carolina
Texas
Washington

In accordance with federal regulations at 20 CFR 653.107(i), these States must assign full time year round staff to outreach duties. The remainder of the significant MSFW States shall 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(s) of the highest activity. Such outreach staff shall be bilingual if warranted by the characteristics of the MSFW population in the State, and shall spend a majority of their time in the field.