

**PY 1997 WAGNER-PEYSER (W-P) PLANNING GUIDANCE  
State Wagner-Peyser Annual Service Plan Framework**

1. New State Workforce Development Systems. During PY 1997, one of the Employment and Training Administration's (ETA) high priority goals will be to work with State Employment Security Agencies (SESAs) to continuously ensure that State public labor exchange programs are in a strong position to play an integral role in emerging State workforce development systems. Currently, public labor exchange programs are the centerpiece of most State One-Stop systems. For many customers, State public labor exchange services will be the most sought services provided in the growing **network of State One-Stop Career Centers**.

The ES Revitalization initiative's emphasis on a strong customer service focus in improving State labor exchange and related programs will continue to enhance SESAs' ability to meet the needs of employers and job seekers in a One-Stop Career Center system. In PY 1997, W-P policy at the Federal level will continue to promote a Federal-State partnership that delivers job finding and employer services through a customer-focused, technology-advanced, increasingly self-serviced, and outcome-driven system. ES Revitalization's **customer service values** continue to provide a basis for improving labor exchange services to job seekers and employers through electronic and mediated services. States should consider in their plans how public labor exchange services in new State workforce development systems are achieving the requirements of the basic labor exchange program at Part 652.3 of the W-P regulations.

2. Labor Exchange Initiatives. Job seekers and employers rely on ETA and State partners to provide better job opportunities for American workers and higher productivity for employers through a broad range of services that increase the efficiency with which the U.S. labor market operates. States are encouraged to use W-P funds to cooperate and assist the Federal partner in implementing these goals in the following areas:

- a. Building an electronic labor exchange network through America's Job Bank (AJB) and State Job Bank Internet linkages at local outlets and self-service options where customers can gain access to those services. States should consider in their plans improving the prospects of direct employer entry of job orders and openings through AJB and a system for

claiming credit for placement of applicants against directly entered job orders. Also, States should consider introducing the Talent Bank, integrated into its labor exchange services mix; and, linking its unemployment insurance (UI) continued claim voice response system to its job bank (see item 3. below), and connecting its job bank to voice response units or remote kiosks.

- b. Enhancing the capacity of its labor exchange staff and services to play a key system-building role in State workforce development through methodologies which may include procedures and processes such as: reviews of State and local operations; indicators of performance to manage its operations; approaches to measuring quality of service and customer satisfaction; entered employment; and utilization of customer satisfaction surveys and plans.
- c. Cooperating with ETA and National Employer Council (NEC), or other business groups to increase efforts to provide for employer input into the operation of the emerging State workforce development systems and conducting effective employer contact programs to improve customer service.
- d. Considering potential impacts of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (welfare reform) on the State's public labor exchange program in areas such as: potential increase, if any, in the number of welfare applicants; impact that such increases may have on local operations and the steps to respond to expanded workloads.
- e. Planning for the inclusion of Work Opportunities Tax Credit (WOTC) as part of its strategy for implementing the work requirements of welfare reform and how the WOTC will be linked with other workforce development services to provide WOTC "qualified" jobseekers with a portfolio of workforce preparation resources to enhance their job-finding potential. The plan may provide for developing maximum employer participation in the WOTC program through public information and outreach; how local "points of access" to the program will be created through delegation of WOTC conditional certification authority to participating agencies; or how the program will be made locally accessible through other means.

- f. Exploring steps to increase the number of job orders and openings received; and ways to reduce the transition time of unemployed workers from unemployment to reemployment.

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

- o Improve their technological capacity to meet the work test and feedback requirements of the State UI system, and seek improved methods to reduce the job search transition time of cyclical and structural (dislocated) unemployed workers.
- o Enhance the scope and depth of labor exchange services to all UI claimants in need of such services and reemployment services to profiled and referred UI claimants. Continued improvement of the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services (WPRS) system for UI claimants is a key step of quality workforce delivery systems. Assisting States in improving the WPRS system is a major priority of all ETA components, and in particular, the U.S. Employment Service. State planning should consider specific steps to accomplish the continued improvement of the WPRS system, and improving the quality and scope of labor exchange services to all claimants and reemployment services to profiled and referred UI claimants likely to exhaust benefits. Some of the indicators which may be considered to enhance performance are: State's UI average duration and exhaustion rates and their reductions; service plans tailored to the reemployment services needs of customers; and State's provision of electronic feedback to the UI component.

4. Services to Veterans. State public labor exchange programs continue to function as the primary source of labor exchange and support activities for our Nation's veterans. As States develop their new workforce development systems, it is important that veterans, particularly disabled veterans, continue to be served in accordance with the applicable provisions of 38 U.S.C. Chapters 41 and 42.

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

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

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

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

A key element for States' PY 1997 W-P plans is preparing for the transition of MSFW services -- including Monitor Advocate services -- in new States' workforce development systems. In preparing their plans, States should consider how the major functions of the Monitor Advocate program -- the role of the State Monitor Advocate, outreach workers, the complaint system and reporting -- would be transitioned into the new systems; and how the State will achieve high standards of customer service and satisfaction for MSFW customers through workforce development system measures of quality of service and customer satisfaction.

PY 1997 STATE AGENCY WAGNER-PEYSER (W-P) PLAN CHECKLIST

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

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

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

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

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

A.	STATE PLAN CONTENT	YES	NO	REMARKS
6	Has the SJTCC/HRIC certified all the component plans and the State plan?			
7	Does the State Agency plan include distinctive descriptions for all "Basic Program" elements, i.e., requirements of Section 8 (d) of the Act as well as 20 CFR 652.6(a) (4)?			
8	Has a plan been submitted describing the use of 10 percent funds under Section 7(b) of the Act and the use of funds under Section 7(d)?			
9	Does the State Agency plan conform to one or more of the three distinctive categories in Section 7(b) of the Act?			
10	Does the plan include how labor exchange activities will be incorporated in the development of the State's One-Stop Career Center (workforce development) systems?			
11	Does the plan include how the State intends to build its electronic labor exchange network:			
	a. America's Job Bank (AJB)/State Job Bank Internet linkages.			
	b. Employers' direct job order entry on the Internet.			
	c. Talent Bank on the Internet.			

A.	STATE PLAN CONTENT	YES	NO	REMARKS
12	Are Services to Unemployment Insurance (UI) Claimants incorporated in the State Plans?			
	a. Describe methods to improve its technological capacity to meet the work test and feedback requirements for all claimants.			
	b. Describe methods to enhance the scope and depth of reemployment services to UI claimants through the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services (WPRS) initiative.			
13	Has the RAVT review identified compliance issues with regard to service to veterans?			
14	Does the State plan include an overall description of the activities planned to provide services to the agricultural community? Does it specifically describe or include the following sections/items?			
	a. Assessment of need			
	b. Outreach plan			
	c. Services provided to MSFWs			
	d. Services provided to agricultural employers			
	e. Integration of services into States' One-Stop Career Center systems			
	f. Monitor Advocate approval or comments			
	g. Affirmative Action Plans (for designated offices)			

A.	STATE PLAN CONTENT	YES	NO	REMARKS
	h. Evidence that JTPA 402 grantees, advocacy groups, agricultural organizations/ employers, and others were given the opportunity to comment on the State plan for Agricultural Services and local office Affirmative Action Plans (copies of correspondence and agency responses may be included in the plan or sent to Regional Office separately with the plan)			
15	Is the MSFW portion of the plan consistent with Enclosure B, Attachment F1, TEGL No. 4-95?			
16	Is the grantee's workplace covered by an annual Drug-Free Workplace Certification as required by 29 CFR Part 98?			
17	Has the grantee submitted an annual certification regarding lobbying as required by 29 CFR Part 93?			
B.	ES COMPONENT PLANS IN DISPUTE			
1	If the State Agency plan includes any ES component plans in dispute, was documentation provided on views and recommendations of all interested parties (Governor, SJTCC/HRIC, State Agency, and PIC/CEO) as required under 20 CFR 652.6(b)?			
2	For each ES component plan in dispute have Regional Office staff prepared an analysis of the matter?			



STATE PLAN FOR AGRICULTURAL 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  
equit  
y  
indic  
ators  
.  
Signi  
fican  
t  
MSFW  
State  
s  
addit  
ional  
ly  
must  
meet  
at  
least  
four  
of  
the  
seven  
minim  
um  
servi  
ce  
level  
indic  
ators  
.

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 or 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, Department of Agriculture, 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 ~~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

over  
ach  
plan  
in  
accor  
dance  
with  
Feder  
al  
requi  
remen  
ts at  
20  
CFR  
Part  
653.  
The  
outre  
ach  
plan  
must  
be  
based  
on  
the  
actua

1  
condi  
tions  
which  
exist  
in  
the  
parti  
cular  
State  
,  
takin  
g  
into  
accou  
nt  
the  
State  
Agenc  
y's  
histo  
ry of  
provi  
ding  
outre  
ach  
servi  
ces,  
the  
estim  
ated  
numbe  
r of  
MSFWs  
in  
the  
State  
, and  
the  
need  
for  
outre  
ach  
servi  
ces  
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 1997 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 fulltime equivalent positions for each local office to which staff are

to be  
assign  
ned,  
and  
the  
numbe  
r of  
staff  
assign  
ned  
to  
the  
State  
offic  
e for  
this  
purpo  
se.



Designated significant local offices 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 indicates difficulty in meeting equity indicators, minimum service 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 in 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-MSFW to MSFWs referred to jobs.
- Ratio of non-MSFW 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  
653.1  
11.  
The  
desig  
natio  
ns  
for  
PY  
1997  
of  
Affir  
mativ  
e  
Plan  
offic  
es is  
provi  
ded  
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 95 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 on 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 on 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 previous year, explain efforts to increase U.S. worker participation.

VI. Tables to Accompany State Plan for Agricultural Services:

Table 1. Significant MSFW States

Table 2. Significant MSFW Local Offices Affirmative Action Plan

Table 3. Minimum Service Level Indicators

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

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

Table 1

SIGNIFICANT STATES FOR PY 1997

TOTAL U.S. MSFW APPLICATIONS		185,252
<u>States</u>		<u>MSFW Applications</u>
1.	California	35,380
2.	Texas	32,166
3.	Florida	23,114
4.	Washington	14,786
5.	North Carolina	14,876
6.	Michigan	11,046
7.	Puerto Rico	8,530
8.	Arizona	8,017
9.	Georgia	7,523
10.	Oregon	5,725
11.	Virginia	4,739
12.	South Carolina	4,086
13.	Minnesota	4,000
14.	Idaho	2,392
15.	New Mexico	1,768
16.	Ohio	1,730
17.	New York	1,483
18.	Wisconsin	1,403
19.	Colorado	1,063
20.	North Dakota	796





Table 2

SIGNIFICANT MSFW LOCAL OFFICES--AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN FOR 1997

<u>MSFW Significant Offices</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>MSFW Applications</u>	<u>Cumulative MSFW Applications</u>
1. Edinburg, TX	VI	4,674	
2. Weslaco, TX	VI	4,980	9,654
3. McAllen, TX	VI	4,539	14,193
4. Eagle Pass, TX	VI	3,306	17,439
5. Sunnyside, WA	X	2,863	20,362
6. Exmore, VA	III	4,106	24,468
7. Sanger, CA	IX	2,355	26,823
8. Oxnard, CA	IX	2,756	29,579
9. Brownsville, TX	VI	2,516	32,095
10. Yuma, AZ	IX	5,356	37,451
11. Yakima, WA	X	2,207	39,658
12. Moses Lake, WA	X	2,023	41,681

Total MSFW Applications: 189,735 x 20% = 37,947

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

Table 3

MINIMUM SERVICE LEVEL INDICATORS, PY 1997  
Percentage of MSFW's

Significant MSFWs States (PY 1996)	(1) # MSFWs Placed	(2) Placed \$.50 above Hourly Wage	(3) Placed on Long-Term Non-ag. Jobs
Arizona	42.5%	14.0%	3.8%
California	42.5	14.0	4.9
Colorado	42.5	14.0	5.9
Florida	42.5	14.0	6.0
Georgia	42.5	14.0	3.3
Idaho	42.5	14.0	7.3
Michigan	42.5	14.0	3.8
Minnesota	42.5	14.0	3.4
New Mexico	42.5	14.0	3.3
New York	42.5	14.0	6.5
North Carolina	42.5	14.0	5.0
North Dakota	42.5	14.0	4.5
Ohio	42.5	14.0	4.4
Oregon	42.5	14.0	6.2
Pennsylvania	42.5	14.0	8.0
Puerto Rico	42.5	4.5	4.0
South Carolina	42.5	14.0	3.9
Texas	42.5	14.0	8.2
Virginia	42.5	14.0	5.2
Washington	42.5	14.0	3.3
Wisconsin	42.5	14.0	3.5

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

(4) Local Office Reviews: One hundred percent of significant MSFW local offices shall be reviewed by State or Federal staff.

(5) Field Checks: Commencing with PY 95, minimum performance levels were established by the States per 20 CFR 653.112(c).

(6) Outreach Staff Contacts: Commencing with PY 95, minimum performance levels were established by the States per 20 CFR 653.112(c).

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

Table 4

SIGNIFICANT LOCAL OFFICES AND BILINGUAL OFFICES, PY 1997

REGION I

Connecticut

Hartford

Massachusetts

Fitchburg

Holyoke\*

Lawrence

Lowell\*

Springfield\*

REGION II

New Jersey

Hammonton

Vineland/Bridgeton

New York

Albion

Batavia/Elba

Hudson

Kingston

Lockport

Middleton/Pine Island\*

Newark

Riverhead

Puerto Rico

Aguadilla\*

Arecibo/Manati\*

Caguas/Cayey\*

Guayama\*

Humacao/Fajardo\*

Mayaguez/San German\*

Ponce/Coamo\*

Bayamon

REGION III

Delaware

Dover\*

Virginia

Exmore\*

Winchester

Maryland

Chestertown\*

Crisfield\*

West Virginia

Martinsburg

Hagerstown\*

Pennsylvania

Gettysburg\*

Chambersburg\*

REGION IV

Florida

Apollo Beach\*

Apopka\*

Belle Glade\*

Bradenton\*

Fort Pierce\*

Homestead\*

Immokalee\*

Naples\*

Plant City\*

Quincy\*

Sebring\*

Wauchula\*

Winter Haven\*

Georgia

Americus\*

Bainbridge\*

Cordele\*

Douglas\*

Moultrie/Camille\*

Tifton\*

Vidalia\*

North Carolina

Clinton

Dunn\*

Elizabethtown

Hendersonville\*

Kenansville\*

Kinston\*

Mt. Olive

Washington

Wilson\*

Smithfield\*

New Bern

South Carolina

Aiken\*

Beaufort\*

Charleston\*

Spartanburg\*

Sumter\*

Kingstree\*

REGION V

Illinois

Danville\*

Kankakee\*

Murphysboro/Cobden\*

Peoria\*

Michigan

Adrian\*  
Bay City\*  
Bear Lake\*  
Greenville\*

Hartford\*  
Sparta\*  
Traverse City\*

Minnesota

Crookston\*  
East Grand Forks\*  
Fergus Falls\*

Moorhead\*  
Owatonna\*  
Willmar\*

Ohio

Bowling Green/Genoa\*  
Fremont\*

Wisconsin

Beaver Dam\*

Wautoma\*

REGION VI

New Mexico

Deming\*

Las Cruces\*

Texas

Brownsville\*  
Canutillo  
Carrizo Springs  
Crystal City\*  
Del Rio\*  
Eagle Pass\*  
Edinburg\*  
Fabens  
Floydada-Sub. Office\*  
Hereford  
Laredo

Lamesa  
McAllen\*  
Muleshoe-Sub. Office  
Pecos  
Plainview\*  
Raymondville\*  
Uvalde\*  
Weslaco\*

REGION VII

None

REGION VIII

Colorado

Brighton\*

Lamar\*

Delta\*  
Greeley\*

Rocky Ford\*  
Monte Vista

Montana  
Sidney\*

North Dakota  
Grafton\*

Utah  
Brigham City\*

REGION IX

Arizona  
Coolidge\*  
Douglas\*  
Wilcox\*

Yuma\*  
Maryvale

California  
Blythe\*  
Chico  
Colusa\*  
Delano\*  
El Centro\*  
Fresno (West)\*  
Gilroy  
Greenfield\*  
Hanford\*  
Hollister\*  
Huron\*  
Indio\*  
Lakeport\*  
Lamont\*  
Los Baños\*

Madera\*  
Marysville\*  
Mendota\*  
Merced\*  
Modesto  
Oceanside\*  
Oroville\*  
Oxnard\*  
Porterville\*  
Salinas\*  
Sanger\*  
Santa Maria\*  
Stockton  
Turlock\*  
Ukiah\*  
Visalia\*  
Wasco\*  
Watsonville\*

REGION X

Idaho  
Bonner's Ferry\*  
Burley\*  
Canyon County\*  
Emmett\*

Payette\*  
Rexburg\*  
Twin Falls\*  
Mountain Home

Oregon

Madras\*  
Milton-Freewater\*  
Woodburn\*

Hood River  
Ontario  
The Dalles

Washington

Bellingham\*  
Columbia Gorge\*  
Moses Lake\*  
Mount Vernon\*  
Okanogan\*

Sunnyside\*  
Tri Cities\*  
Walla Walla\*  
Wenatchee\*  
Yakima\*

\*Bilingual Offices



Table 5

STATES WITH HIGHEST ESTIMATED YEAR-ROUND ACTIVITIES

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

California	Texas
Florida	Washington
North Carolina	

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