

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: Gubernatorial Papers,
1966-74: Press Unit

Folder Title: California State Office of Economic Opportunity
– Evaluation Report 03/26/1971 (7 of 7)

Box: P27

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

IV. COMMUNITY ACCEPTABILITY

FILL OUT IN DETAIL WITH MOST RECENT INFORMATION.
INCLUDE NAMES, TITLES, AND AFFILIATIONS OF ALL
CONTACTS.

A. ATTACH RELEVANT NEWSPAPER ARTICLES OR OTHER PUBLICITY
CIRCULATED ABOUT GRANTEE, DELEGATE AGENCY, PROGRAM OR
PERSONNEL.

B. ARE ELECTED OFFICIALS AWARE OF THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES
UNDER THE GREEN AMENDMENT? EXPLAIN

C. HAS THERE BEEN A RECENT REVIEW OF THE GRANTEE UNDER THE
PROVISIONS OF THE GREEN AMENDMENT?

D. OPINIONS AND OBSERVATIONS OF ELECTED OFFICIALS:

E. OPINIONS AND OBSERVATIONS OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC, PRIVATE
ORGANIZATIONS, SOCIAL AND FRATERNAL GROUPS, ETC.

F. OPINIONS AND OBSERVATIONS OF THE INTENDED PARTICIPANTS AND/OR RECIPIENTS OF THE PROGRAM:

G. IS THERE A POSSIBILITY THAT THIS PROGRAM MAY BE USED FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES? HAS IT BEEN IN THE PAST? FOR PARTISAN, NON-PARTISAN OR IN A THREATENING POLITICAL MANNER?

H. IS THERE A POSSIBILITY THAT THIS PROGRAM MAY BE USED FOR COMMUNITY AGITATION RATHER THAN THE OBJECTIVES STATED IN SECTION 201 OF EOA, SUCH AS ILLEGAL PICKETING AND BOYCOTTING?

I. IS THERE ANY INDICATION OF PAST CRIMINAL ACTIVITY BY THE GRANTEE/DELEGATE AGENCY OR ITS PERSONNEL?

V. FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

- A. IS THERE A RECENT DOCUMENT ON FILE ATTESTING TO THE ADEQUACY OF INTERNAL CONTROLS AND THE ACCOUNTING SYSTEM? BY WHOM?

- B. WHEN WAS THE MOST RECENT OEO AUDIT?

- C. ARE THERE ANY UNRESOLVED AUDIT DISALLOWANCES? WHAT ARE THEY? AMOUNT?

VI. MANAGEMENT CAPABILITY

- A. ARE THERE ADEQUATE PERSONNEL POLICIES? ARE THEY DISTRIBUTED TO ALL PERSONNEL?

i

- B. ARE THERE ADEQUATE CONTROLS ON INVENTORY OF EQUIPMENT? BOTH PURCHASED AND EXCESS?

VII. OEO COORDINATION

NAME OF FIELD REPRESENTATIVE _____

WAS HE CONTACTED? YES _____ NO _____

Attachment #2

Shasta County Community Action Project

P. O. DRAWER A.V.

214 SO. MARKET STREET

REDDING, CALIFORNIA 96001

(916) 241-7631

September 22, 1970

Chick Tooker, Vista Program Manager
Regional Office
Office of Economic Opportunity
100 McAllister Street
San Francisco, California

Dear Chick:

During the morning of September 22, 1970, I received a visit from Mr. Sal Espana and Mrs. Terry McGinnis from State OEO. They stated that the nature of their concern was to "review our Vista problem" and "help in solving any problems which might exist".

Very soon in the process it was clear that they were here to "investigate" our project and more specifically the Vista Indian component of that project as it related to "the Pit River Tribal movement".

I was quized as to how I thought that they could be of help and attempted to indicate that they could be of help in training and technical assistance when new Vistas arrive. They wanted to know what problems existed currently with Vistas, and I indicated that I didn't believe we had any serious problems in that we were attempting to get closer working "teams" involving Vista with other staff personnel around priority program areas, such as education.

I gave a historical review of my utilization of Vista which covered the following points: (1) When I arrived, Vistas were "doing their own thing" which meant that they did what they wanted to do when they wanted to do it if they wanted to do it. (2) That I began immediately to attempt to develop a team approach and incorporate Vista personnel as staff persons with equal status within the total agency. (3) That at one point we had to let a Vista or two go because their needs and our needs could not be mutually dealt with. (4) That I felt during the last program year we had good rapport with Vista OEO. (5) That I felt that our internal organization and utilization of Vistas was good over the last year in that they were considered staff persons and operated as such within given work areas. (6) That the major problem we had during the last year had to do with time and distance problems relating to giving inadequate support to the Vista Indian

Attachment #2

Shasta County Community Action Project

P. O. DRAWER A.V.

204 SO. MARKET STREET

REDDING, CALIFORNIA 96001

(916) 241-7631

September 22, 1970

Chick Tooker, Vista Program Manager
Regional Office
Office of Economic Opportunity
100 McAllister Street
San Francisco, California

Dear Chick:

During the morning of September 22, 1970, I received a visit from Mr. Sal Espana and Mrs. Terry McGinnis from State OEO. They stated that the nature of their concern was to "review our Vista problem" and "help in solving any problems which might exist".

Very soon in the process it was clear that they were here to "investigate" our project and more specifically the Vista Indian component of that project as it related to "the Pit River Tribal movement".

I was quized as to how I thought that they could be of help and attempted to indicate that they could be of help in training and technical assistance when new Vistas arrive. They wanted to know what problems existed currently with Vistas, and I indicated that I didn't believe we had any serious problems in that we were attempting to "get closer working "teams" involving Vista with other staff personnel around priority program areas, such as education.

I gave a historical review of my utilization of Vista which covered the following points: (1) When I arrived, Vistas were "doing their own thing" which meant that they did what they wanted to do when they wanted to do it if they wanted to do it. (2) That I began immediately to attempt to develop a team approach and incorporate Vista personnel as staff persons with equal status within the total agency. (3) That at one point we had to let a Vista or two go because their needs and our needs could not be mutually dealt with. (4) That I felt during the last program year we had good rapport with Vista OEO. (5) That I felt that our internal organization and utilization of Vistas was good over the last year in that they were considered staff persons and operated as such within given work areas. (6) That the major problem we had during the last year had to do with time and distance problems relating to giving inadequate support to the Vista Indian

Project. (7) That we had remedied this situation by going through the Grant process with Vista Regional and typing up our proposal and integrating Indian Vistas into the educational program. (8) That the only problem this CAP had with the Vista proposal was that it was not practical to write one project for 25 Vistas. (9) That we were able to submit three sub-project ideas in education, legal aid, and economic development. (10) That education and legal aid were approved by Vista. (11) That we were negotiating on a sub-project component dealing with economic development. (12) That I would recommend that our thinking about incorporating Vistas into the staffing pattern of CAP be continued.

Attention then focused on the Indian Vista Project and "problems" which may have been outside guidelines. In my response, I made the following points: (1) That it was in fact, from the stand point of the overall community, difficult to separate in the minds of the public at large the Vista Indian component from the Pit River movement. (2) That in fact things could be separated as we made every effort to give direction and guidance so that activities were within the guidelines. (3) That the major focus of activities were around educational needs, including tutorial programs, dealing with the ESEA Title I Project where the school district made commitments for involving Indian persons and had not, and establishing an Indian counseling program in the eastern end of the county. (3) That when we got wind that the movement was occurring, we took the following actions: (a) Removed all GSA and CAP cars, (b) Wrote Vista Legal Council so that we could clarify some positions, more specifically around guidelines, (c) Communicated this information both in writing and verbally to the Vistas so that they could make personal decisions about whether or not they needed to resign if their activities were going to be outside OEO guidelines.

Mr. Sal Espana then brought up the matter of whether or not I thought our Board of Directors should "review" the Vista Indian Project. I indicated that I did not think it was necessary as the Board had been informed, particularly the Executive Committee, about the Vista Indian Project matters.

At one point he kept pressing the issue and I asked him outright if he thought the CAP Board should again review it, and Mrs. Terry McGinnis indicated that she thought that it would be appropriate, Mr. Espana took a middle of the road position without coming up with a recommendation. However, he indicated that if in their day in Shasta County, they had evidence that appropriate actions were not taken, it would probably be appropriate for the Board to consider the matter.

Both Mr. Espana and Mrs. McGinnis indicated that there were "letters directed towards the Governor's office" about the concern of the project and the Pit River Movement. I asked if the letters came from any particular geographical portion of the community, namely the eastern end of the county, or if it was wide spread, they indicated that it was wide spread they thought.

A few words about my approach to the matter. I attempted to remain cool, co-operative, informative to the point of not adding any additional information than they already had on the basis that I would react to what they brought to me at the time that that information was made available.

My plan now is to push both Mr. Espana and Mrs. McGinnis for actual facts, figures, and written documentation to any allegations that they make before I take action with the Board in a formal manner.

Such is the case, keep the peace, and we will work the matter out.

Sincerely yours,



Ed Forbes
Executive Director

EF/PKB

cc: Gaylyn Boone, Field Representative

THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND THE SEOO

Attachments

REF.
PAGE

"MURPHY TELEGRAM" 53

Telegram

LA125 804575 L FFA495

10 00 PM 5 35

(SF 303FF130495) PD=WU LGR SAC 0723P EST 10/30/70 =
 ZCZC 040 RR PDB SACRAMENTO CALIF 30 210P PST = *1 house*
 NEIL BODINE-DLR DONT FONE DLY CHGS GNTTED = *WC*
 1717 WIF ST LODESTO CALIF =

WE HAVE JUST RECEIVED A VITAL MESSAGE FROM SENATOR
 GEORGE MURPHY IN RESPONSE TO OUR REQUEST THAT HE
 SPEARHEAD RESTORATION OF RECENT CUTBACKS IN CALIFORNIA'S
 HEAD START FUNDS. ==

SENATOR MURPHY STATES: "CITIZENS FROM ALL CORNERS
 OF CALIFORNIA HAVE EXPRESSED CONCERN OVER RECENT CUTS IN
 THE HEAD START BUDGET. AS YOU MAY KNOW, I AM CO-SPONSOR
 OF LEGISLATION, S. 3480, THE COMPREHENSIVE HEAD START AND

WU 1201 (R 5-69)

1970 OCT 30 PM 5 35

0819P EST) =

CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1970, WHICH WOULD INCREASE HEAD
 START FUNDING BY 123 MILLION OVER THE FY 1971 EXPENDITURE
 ON RECONVENING OF CONGRESS IN NOVEMBER I PLEDGE TO LEAD
 THE FIGHT TO RESTORE HEAD START FUNDS FOR CALIFORNIA. MY
 THANKS TO YOU AND CONCERNED CITIZENS THROUGHOUT CALIFORNI
 FOR BRINGING THIS CRITICAL SITUATION SO FORCEFULLY TO MY
 ATTENTION. PLEASE CONVEY THIS IMPORTANT MESSAGE TO YOUR
 ENTIRE STAFF AND TO INTERESTED CITIZENS IN YOUR COMMUNIT

LEWIS K. UHLER, DIRECTOR =

STATE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ==

S. 3480 1970 FY 1971 ALSO \$123 :

6:10 PM 10/30/70

EVALUATION TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

Attachments

	REF. <u>PAGE</u>
O. MEARL CUSTER ltr to LEWIS K. UHLER dtd 1/15/71	58
LEWIS K. UHLER ltr to O. MEARL CUSTER dtd 2/8/71	58

ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ELK GROVE, CALIFORNIA 95624

Elk Grove 685-4636
Sacramento 421-7567

January 15, 1971

O. MEARL CUSTER
Director, Special Projects

Mr. Louis K. Uhler, Director
State Economic Opportunity Office
State Department of Human Resources Development
800 Capital Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Uhler:

It has been approximately five months since the last meeting of the State Economic Opportunity Advisory Committee. I believe it is appropriate that we call a meeting of this committee sometime in February.

I believe the Advisory Committee should hear progress reports on the important work your staff is accomplishing in its oversight of the War on Poverty in California.

Another area of interest to us: to what extent are the C.A.P. Agencies using the technical assistance which we (the committee) requested. You gave notice of the availability of this assistance in your memorandum of October 27, 1970. I am sure there are other areas or items you would like to add to the agenda for this meeting.

Since Thursday seems to be a good day for the committee members, I suggest we set the date of February 11, 18 or 25.

If you will select a date convenient for your busy schedule and list items for the agenda, I will send notices to the members of the committee.


Sincerely,

O. Mearl Custer
O. Mearl Custer

OMC:jeh

cc: Advisory Committee Members
H. Rodger Betts, Regional O.E.O. Director
Robert LaFosso, Interagency Coordinator
Reading File

LER

RONALD REAGAN
GOVERNOR

Office of Economic Opportunity
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
800 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO 95814
916 445-9670 OR 445-7011

February 8, 1971

O. Mearl Custer
Elk Grove Unified School District
Elk Grove, California 95624

Dear Mr. Custer:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding State OEO Advisory Committee meetings.

You may recall that subsequent to the refunding of this office in late August, 1970, I mentioned to you that there was no provision in the grant for an advisory committee. For this reason we indicated to you that there would be no further need for the Advisory Committee to convene.

We have been studying the possibility of developing a State-wide commission or board that can not only assist our office in a continuing evaluation of poverty problems within the State but is in the position to mobilize independent and private sector resources to assist us in the accomplishment of our mission. We will inform you of the details, when finalized.

Thank you for your assistance to this office in the past. Please convey our thanks to the other members of the former Advisory Committee for their past efforts.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Lewis K. Uhler', written over a horizontal line.

LEWIS K. UHLER
Director

LKU:dks

RECEIVED

FEB 17 1971

Elk Grove Unified School Dist.
Special Projects

OEO, STAP And ATAC Sponsor 'Communication Interchange'

Not many people have ever associated the National Guard with the war on poverty, but in California the Guard command is straining at the bit to employ their resources in any number of ways to help communities and counties fight poverty.

Rural community action leaders were amazed to see Colonel Wolf and Major Salcedo of the California National Guard as principle speakers at a poverty conference. And they were more amazed when both officers outlined what the California National Guard has done up to now in community poverty programs and what they are ready, willing and able to do in the future if red tape and confusion are eliminated.

Major Salcedo pointed out that the National Guard has the capability of everything from road building to minimal medical care, such as mass immunization programs within their scope but the roadblock holding up their potential is red tape, bureaucratic ambiguities and illusive "guidelines".

It was the first in a series of conferences set up by OEO State Director Lewis K. Uhler and sponsored jointly by the OEO, the State Technical Assistance Program (STAP), and the American Technical Assistance Corporation (ATAC), a private contract consultant firm working for the OEO.

"What we want to do," Uhler said in his opening remarks at the conference held in Sacramento on December 15 and 16, "is identify every resource available to people working at the local level so that each of you knows who can help, how they can help and how to get in touch with assistance agencies."

According to Uhler, he views the primary role of his staff as ombudsmen. "We have to be able to tell local

people how they can get a job done locally and open a few doors for them to get started."

The two-day conference included representatives from the State Department of Commerce, the Business and Transportation Agency, Industrial Relations Department, the Division of Forestry, Department of Agriculture, the California National Guard, Fish and Game, the HRD Farm Labor Department, Department of Education, Department of Corrections, Social Welfare, Youth Authority, Commission on Aging, Public Health, Mental Hygiene, Migrant Health Service and the California Medical Association, with sub-departments of all agencies involved with rural poverty.

The conference was highlighted by an extensive seminar on how rural communities can set up intern training programs for the development of para-professional housing advisors for rural areas.

The interns selected would train for para-professional positions with the ultimate objective of improving rural housing conditions in California. Many rural Californians are eligible for low-cost loans for housing through the Farmers Home Administration, but they are uninformed as how to apply for loans.

The rural housing interns would make known all provisions for housing assistance in rural areas.

"We hope that our two-day seminar provided a communications forum for community leaders. If nothing else, they met State department heads, and now they know who to call about local programs," Uhler said at the close of the session.

Sixty-four community action agency leaders, representing twenty rural counties, attended the two-day resources identification conference held at Sacramento's Mansion Inn.

Santa Cruz Community Action Agency Grant Disapproved By State Office

State Office can "Find no justification for continuance of Santa Cruz Program"


Robert Hawkins, Assistant Director for Northern California of the State Office of Economic Opportunity, commenting on the veto recommendation sent to H. Rodger Betts, OEO Western Regional Director, stated that SEEO's evaluation of the program indicated without a shadow of a doubt that the poor of Santa Cruz "are not participating in any significant manner in the poverty program and that this lack of participation is caused by policy decisions at the Community Action Board and administrative levels."

SEEO was most critical of the management of the Santa Cruz Area Service Center. In commenting on the SCASC, Hawkins quoted from the veto message: "The evidence compiled by this office and the lack of evidence offered by concerned parties indicates that the poor served by the SCASC have been little affected by this program. We can find no evidence suggesting that the poor have organized themselves into viable target area groups, that they have taken part in major policy decisions regarding the planning and operation of the

SCASC . . . through their democratically-selected representatives.' Further evidence to be presented indicates that the program is poorly governed by its Board, lacks strong and consistent administration and has little relevance to the poor."

SEEO's evaluation revealed, among other things, that revolutionary literature and pamphlets were to be found at the SCASC. OEO Regulation 6907-2 forbids this sort of political material.

A conflict of interests exists, according to the recent evaluation, due to the fact that the Reverend C. C. Ellis, President of the Community Action Board (also a Board member of SCASC) is also a member of an allegedly religious group called the "Lillies of the Field, Inc." that rents the building occupied by SCASC. The SCASC in turn rents the building from "Lillies of the Field, Inc." It was further revealed that the "Lillies of the Field" organization is not now incorporated "nor has it applied to the Secretary of State for incorporation."



State agency representatives at the December resources identification conference discussing methods of cooperation for rural community action leaders.

Housing Internship For Rural Areas

The State Office of Economic Opportunity announced a comprehensive rural housing internship program in December to "deliver homes to deserving rural applicants in California".

Bob Frane, assigned to the State Office of Economic Opportunity under a grant which provides special technical assistance in the field of rural housing, and Mr. Douglas Young, State Director of the Farmers Home Administration, announced the program in December.

The new internship program will provide intensive training by the Farmers Home Administration to prepare rural Community Action Agency staffs with expertise in the utilization of Farmers Home Administration housing funds which are presently available to rural Californians.

"Many rural Californians are totally unaware of such programs as #502, #502 special and #504 of the Farmers Home Administration. These two programs are available to rural communities with a population of less than 5,500," Frane said. "The 502 program will provide immediate funds for the construction of new homes or purchase of existing houses. The 504 program can be used to rehabilitate substandard rural housing. It is unfortunate

that only a few citizens in rural California are familiar with the benefits of these two important programs.

"As with so many other government agencies which are mandated to implement these types of programs, the Farmers Home Administration does not have sufficient personnel available to carry out the intent of Congress. For this reason, we have created our California Rural Housing Internship Program," Frane continued. The Housing Internship Program, according to Frane, will be implemented through rural Community Action Agencies functioning with the assistance of the State Office of Economic Opportunity. Selected housing interns from the local Community Action Agency staffs will be given intensive training in Farmers Home Administration housing programs. These interns will then be under the direct field supervision of the Farmers Home Administration area supervisors. The intern will act as liaison between the Farmers Home Administration and the local Community Action Agency.

"What our new internship program is intended to do is provide a means of communication and assistance for low- and moderate-income families in California rural

(Continued on Page 4)

SEOO To Feature Ombudsman Role For Local Action Programs

One thing is painfully obvious in government-administered programs, a general confusion because of the rigid guidelines that more often than not restrict (or constrict) the problem-solving ability of governmental units. In short, it is hard to be creative in a tangle of red tape.

SEOO has thus instilled ombudsmanship as the order of the day. The surprising tangle that seems to lead to static administrative action is nourished by a lack of communication between the various government agencies. SEOO is bound and determined to open the doors of government so department heads begin to ask fellow department heads for advice and counsel.

When government bureaus begin to communicate with private enterprise, there is the basis for really creative social economic planning. It is the intention of the SEOO to open as many doors as possible between government offices and private enterprise.

HOUSING INTERNSHIP (Continued from Page 3)

areas thereby providing much needed housing. This is the first attempt, to my knowledge, to coordinate the government program activities on an interagency level to utilize the resources of federal, state and local capabilities," Frane concluded.

Due to the enthusiastic response from rural Community Action Agencies to the Housing Internship Program, held at the Mansion Inn in Sacramento in December, Lewis Uhler, State Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, stated that the recent conference of rural community action leaders is only the first in a series of planned conferences to identify resources available to local Community Action Agencies.

OEO Indian Dental Aid Program Under Way

Seventy percent of the American Indians in California have never had dental care. There has never been a coordinated program to provide dental service to Indians on the Reservation until recently. Thanks to Bill Simpson, employee of a dental supply house in Los Angeles.

Bill has become the volunteer coordinator of the Indian Dental Program—a resourceful marriage of the public and private sector to provide dental care for Reservation Indians.

Bill, all on his own, managed to get almost \$100,000 worth of dental equipment donated to the program, but getting the equipment was just the first step. The equipment was stored in a warehouse in Van Nuys, and for a while Bill thought it would remain there indefinitely.

Bill consulted with the State OEO office and staff members sought the aid of the California Air National Guard. The Guard offered to take the equipment to isolated Indian Reservations by helicopter. The second problem was thus solved.

But there was still the need for dentists and dental aides to administer dental care. Bill and the OEO office contacted volunteer dentists who would administer care, but how were they to be transported to isolated Reservations? The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) offered to provide aircraft and pilots to fly the dentists in.

So today, with the ingenuity of one man and the generosity and cooperation of many, Indians on California Reservations have dental care available.

Joint Christmas Air Lift

The California State Office of Economic Opportunity joined with the California National Guard to carry out a "Christmas air lift" to the American Indians of Northern California. The joint venture resulted from a request from the Inter-tribal Council.

The California Air National Guard delivered food, toys, supplies, and equipment to the Redding and Alturas areas on December 23. The supplies were then distributed directly to the Indians who reside in the rural areas of Northern California.

Lewis K. Uhler, State Director, stated, "The Office of Economic Opportunity wishes to congratulate and

thank our friends in the California National Guard. We received wonderful cooperation from all concerned and particularly from Col. Andrew Wolf and Major Frank Salcedo. The units participating were the Headquarters and Headquarters Company of the Second Battalion, 159th Infantry in San Jose, and the Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment of the 1401st Engineer Battalion in Redding, California. These are units of the California Army National Guard.

"The aircraft was from the 129th Special Operations Group, California Air National Guard, based in Hayward, California."



memorandum

Date : February 26, 1971

Subject: Fund Raising Ideas
for Youth Programs

Lewis K. Uhler, Director
Office of Economic Opportunity

LKU

During the coming months, our office will be sending you ideas for fund raising, alternate funding sources, and program development. Along with such ideas would be a format to follow for employing these ideas and thus making them a reality in your community. I would appreciate your personal reaction to the material we send you as well as any other ideas you have that can be shared with CAAs and CAPs throughout the State. Please discuss these ideas and the accompanying material at your next CAA Board Meeting and CAP Staff Meeting to maximize program communication.

Attached to this memorandum, you will find a specific idea developed by Contra Costa County in raising funds for summer youth work programs to provide transportation for low-income youth to employment. Your response to implementation of this idea and evaluation of its strengths and weaknesses would be appreciated by this office.

LKU:plg

Attachments

SKATING FAIR
FUND RAISING PROJECT FOR YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

IDEA: Skating Fair

WHO TO CONTACT: Local ice or roller skating rinks in your community

WHEN TO PLAN PROGRAM: Before spring vacation, summer vacation, or Christmas recess

HOW TO ORGANIZE THIS IDEA:

1. Contact local skating rinks in your area to see if they would be interested in sponsoring a benefit fund raising fair. The proceeds from this fair would go to your youth program to provide transportation or defray other costs raised by the funds.

The participating rink (ice or roller) may use the proceeds given you from this fund raising idea as a tax write-off while your local CAP project may use the funds raised as additional local SHARE.

2. If rinks in your area are interested in this approach, then next contact the local superintendent of schools. Present the idea of a fund raising program for low-income youth through the distribution of fliers to all children in the entire school system.
3. If the idea is approved by both the rink and the county school superintendent, then have fliers printed up similar to the one attached stating the type of fund raising project, date of the fair, donation cost, and sponsor. Separate the fliers into packets of 30-35 each and deliver to schools with sufficient packets to be distributed to every classroom in each school in the participating district or area. Thus, each school should have sufficient fliers for every student in the district. Pre-packaging of this material by your CAP will expedite distribution and assure maximum disbursement of the fliers.

SUGGESTIONS:

1. Plan such a fund raising fair for two consecutive Friday afternoons between the hours of 3:00 and 8:00 p.m. These are low attendance times for most skating rinks and are good times for parents to drop off their children while they shop.
2. Plan the two skating fair days to be held at least three weeks before each of the holiday periods.

Try to get the rink to turn over 100 percent of the proceeds in return for the distribution of fliers that will advertise their rink.

CAUTION: Be sure the only advertising on the flier is a masthead of the rink but not a direct advertisement.

3. Be sure to use radio, television and newspaper coverage about the fair at least two weeks prior to when the skating day takes place.
4. Upon completion of the fund raising fair, be sure to have a photograph in the local newspaper with the rink owner, superintendent of schools, and a CAA representative receiving the proceeds from this fund raising event.

Please send us a copy of any publicity concerning this idea.


A sample flier and letter to school principals are attached for your information and use.

If you have any questions about this idea or desire more information, please contact our office.

Member Ice Skating Institute of America



Project Summer-Job Benefit



In cooperation with the County Department of Education, CAP Job Development and Training Project, the Sun Valley Ice Arena is sponsoring a benefit Ice Skating Fair with proceeds going to the 1971 Summer Youth Employment Program.

DONATION: \$1.00 - Includes Skate Rental

DATE: Friday, December 4th

Friday, December 11th

TIME: 3:00 to 7:00 P.M.



This one sheet offer is good for all the family. This is a donation and will also be a discount rate. A child, 11 & under will save 35c; a teen, 12-17 will save 65c; an adult will save 85c.

LET'S HELP A GOOD CAUSE AND ALL GO ICE SKATING!!!!

Located in the Fabulous Sun Valley Shopping Center

**BE SURE TO BRING THIS SHEET WITH YOU.
IT IS YOUR DISCOUNT TICKET TO THE RINK**

Dear Principal:

Your district superintendent has authorized distribution of these flyers. There are 35 flyers to each package. Please distribute to each classroom so each student receives one copy.

We appreciate your cooperation in helping to raise funds for the annual PROJECT SUMMERJOB. This project obtains summer jobs for youth in Contra Costa County. The administration of this project is handled jointly by the Contra Costa County Department of Education and by the CAP Job Development and Training Project, 75 Santa Barbara Road, Pleasant Hill, California.

THE SECO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

Attachments

	REF. <u>PAGE</u>
NAPA REPORT	31
TULARE REPORT	32
SOLANO REPORT	32
FRESNO REPORT	32
ROBERT B. HAWKINS ltr to REV. H. H. LUSK dtd 10/27/70	32
REV. H. H. LUSK ltr to LEWIS K. UHLER dtd 10/15/70	32
GIL ARCHULETTA ltr to ERNEST SPRINKLES dtd 2/9/71	32
ED FORBES ltr to CHICK TOOKER dtd 9/22/70	32

Area: Napa
Date: Wednesday-Thursday, January 20-21, 1971
Contact: Steve Graham

Problems: State is working county against city to oppose the Napa program. Napa given veto and no constructive suggestions made on program improvement.

County has opposition to OEO housing programs.

County needs alternate funding sources and food resources for poor of the area.

City supports program; county fears the program; county is seeking to set up competing program that OEO began in the area: health, housing, family assistance, etc.

Discussion: 1. Weak projects
2. More direct cooperation
3. Meeting between OEO, city, county people
4. Evaluations based on performance both internal (administrative) and external (programmatic).

Needs: 1. Housing cooperation, food stamp and surplus foods in combination, alternate funding resources for rural CAP's.

2. Lift veto by Governor even though Federal refunded the program.

3. Alternate funding specialist for new funding resources.

4. Joint Regional and State OEO evaluation of program and its community relationship.

P.S. I received your letter dated January 19, 1971 and appreciate the correspondence and ideas. However, the last two sentences of the first paragraph are both in error and out of context.

My point was that in my functioning with the State office and the CAP's, I would leave politics out and concentrate on developing innovative and competent programs. OEO by its very nature is a political program, however, its internal administration should be based on a functioning management process rather than purely political decisions.

Area: Tulare County (Visalia)
Date: Wednesday, January 13, 1971
Contact: Nat Unikel

Problems: CAP asserted its organization and functioning problems are minimal. Desire more alternate funding sources and assistance from State in locating such sources. SEOO fails to contact CAP before coming into area, operates quietly behind the scenes then appears before Board of Supervisors to provide advocacy to create CAP under Board of Supervisors in accord with Green Amendments -- prefers to have this out in the open.

Discussion: 1. Elimination of weak projects, CAP not disagreeing with State position, if State sincere.
2. Development of a San Joaquin Valley Inter-CAP Assistance Unit so that each CAP with like problems would be able to assist one another to further serve the interests of the poor, area-wide.
3. No real problem with State office because they have been left alone without outside interference.
4. Semi-annual evaluations would be cooperated with if instituted.
5. ATAC has been helpful to them, training conference okay.

Needs: 1. Alternate funding.
2. More general contact.
3. Mobilization of State resources, education, HRD, Department of Agriculture, etc. on behalf of CAP.

Recommendations:

1. Provide a staff person with responsibility for locating alternate funding sources, knowing application requirements, and assist CAP in securing such funding.
2. Develop a San Joaquin area conference for or of CAP administrators to assist in solving their internal and external regional problems.

S. Dr. Bob Rothschild, my old boss at the Contra Costa County Department of Education, sends his greetings.

Area: Solano County (Vallejo)
Date: Wednesday-Thursday, January 20-21, 1971
Contact: James Hulin

Problems: CAP seeks alternate funding sources, duplication of grant guidelines and funding deadline for State and Federal OEO, bi-annual funding so that more time can be devoted to program operations rather than grant preparation, eliminate the "behind-the-back" surveillance of CAP's by State OEO, have representatives inform CAP when in the area.

Discussion: 1. Elimination of weak projects within CAP's.
2. Mobilization of State resources.
3. More personal contact within CAP's in Valley.
4. More mobilization of experts within colleges in the areas.

Needs: 1. Alternate funding sources
2. Two-year funding cycle
3. State OEO to act as advocate for State department needs: information on programs, forms for applications, technical assistance on meeting assistance requirements, politics with departments, and program administration by State as HRD, Agriculture, etc.
4. More assistance from colleges and faculty who are experts in economic and other planning areas.
5. Need direct assistance in having representative in the area for one to four weeks from the creation of an idea until its implementation.
6. State and Regional OEO should get together and provide common areas of assistance and agreement.

Recommendations:

1. We take a position on two-year funding.
2. We hire a full time expert in alternate funding to work with CAP's.
3. A mutual assistance agreement on both field work and technical assistance be arrived at between State and Regional OEO offices.

Area: Fresno
Date: Wednesday, January 13, 1971
Contact: Jim Williams, Dick Price

Problems: No continuity of Field Representatives in Federal or State so that working relationships and confidence can be achieved. Inadequate follow-through on State and Federal representative's recommendations, program objectives, or evaluations. Sometimes, no communications on these areas. Application decision should be concurrent with Regional sign-off so that State veto is not last minute. Equal distribution of all communications and technical assistance, grant materials to rural as well as urban CAP's. San Joaquin area economic development is poor.

Discussion: 1. Assistance in elimination of weak projects.
2. San Joaquin inter-CAP assistance program.
3. Semi-annual evaluations.
4. More contact with State supervisors of programs in addition to representatives.
5. More direct assistance from State with mobilizing educational, State office, and other such resources.

Needs: 1. With mechanization should come plan for what to do with people displaced by such progress before the machine is used in production.
2. More housing and job development assistance to balance the Valley economy.
3. Help with placement of poor in new IRS facility.
4. Constructive assistance from State office, help in implementing ideas of recommendations.

Recommendations:

1. Assist with IRS employment program.
2. Get universities to develop program and plans for providing the needs of those displaced by mechanization in agriculture.
3. Get university and State college economics to work more closely with CAP's where such educational facilities exist.


DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

SAC, CALIFORNIA 93914

October 27, 1970

Reverend H. H. Lusk
Chairman of the Board
Monterey County Anti-Poverty
Coordinating Council, Inc.
P.O. Box 1087
Salinas, California, 93901



Dear Reverend Lusk:

This letter confirms the agreements we reached with you during our visit on 22 October, 1970. However, let me first say that Mr. Charlton and I found our meeting most fruitful. We feel that your positive attitude, joined with those of the County Board of Supervisors, will insure that the coordinated investigation of the MCAPCC will be productive in increasing the program effectiveness of your CAP, and also will increase community support.

Concerning coordination, we have set up the following procedures. First, all information will be shared with your Board and the Regional Office. Second, we have invited the Regional auditor to participate in our review. Third, we have requested that the Office of Inspection, OEO, send a person to participate in the review. Fourth, we will coordinate and work with the Regional Field Representative for Monterey. Fifth, the State will issue a final report to all parties concerned to insure that this investigation has full public disclosure. However, any criminal negligence found during our investigation will be turned over to the proper authorities and will not be made public to guarantee the rights of the accused.

As per our discussion, our auditor will need access to the following records:

- 1) Judith Ehrlich's personnel file. ✓
- 2) Personnel files of all employees, current and terminated.
- 3) Payroll records.
- 4) Time sheets.
- 5) Telephone charge records.
- 6) Gasoline charge records of credit cards.

October 27, 1970


- 7) CAP agency and program component expense records.
- 8) Consultant records for firms and individuals to include record of reports, technical assistance and expenditures for services, by program.
- 9) Travel records for all employees, including vehicle rental, other credit cards, and other related records.
- 10) Cancelled checks and bank records of MCAECC's two checking accounts (Bank of America, Main Branch, Salinas).
- 11) Resumes of present personnel and past employees, and/or consultants.
- 12) Sick-leave records.
- 13) Personal vehicle authorization on OEO jobs by individuals, and records of reimbursements.

To insure that our investigation is thorough, it may be necessary to look at 1969 records. We anticipate that our investigation will commence on Monday, 2 November, 1970. We also hope that we can count on the cooperation of your accountant, Mr. Ron.

It is our hope that this investigation can significantly decrease the lack of trust and hostility among groups and individuals of the poverty program in Monterey County, and effectiveness can be returned to its proper position of pre-eminence. We also hope that through this investigation we will be able to develop a base for your Council through which confidence and support of the full community can be greatly increased. You have stated publicly that this is your desired goal, and we hope that we can assist you in the endeavor.

You can rest assured that the State Office will do everything within its power to maintain the spirit of cooperation that was developed during our meeting of 2 October. It was a pleasure to meet you, and I hope that in the near future we can sit down and talk about increasing the scope and effectiveness of economic development within your CAP.

Sincerely yours,



Robert B. Hawkins, Jr.
Assistant Director
Northern California

RBH:sjd

copy: Monterey County Board of Supervisors

Senator Donald L. Grunsky

Assemblyman Robert Wood

Congressman Burt L. Talcott

Burt Young, District Attorney

William D. Curtis, District Attorney-Elect

Donald W. Senema, DDS

Mexican American Political Action Assn.

REDI Corporation

MONTREY COUNTY
ANTI-POVERTY COORDINATING COUNCIL, Inc.

6 WEST CASILAN STREET • P. O. BOX 1017 • PHONE (408) 424-0001
SALINAS, CALIFORNIA 95061

15 October 1970




Mr. Lewis Uhler
SEOO Director
State of California
Department of Human Resources Development
c/o 800 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Uhler:

A matter has been brought to my attention regarding the State OEO field representative for this area, which I think is very serious and an action which cannot be accepted or condoned as part of the legitimate functions of a SEOO field representative as funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Upon being introduced to Mr. Charlton, both the CAA Board Chairman and myself stated, and received an agreement from your representative, that when he was to be functioning in the area which this CAP serves that he would call, write or otherwise let us know that he was in the area, and the purpose of his visit. We requested and received this agreement mainly to try to avoid some of the problems that have occurred between CAA's and delegate or community groups as well as intra-program relations. This promise has not been honored, and more than that we feel that Mr. Charlton has hardly been our representative long enough to "get his feet wet" before he seems to be deeply involved in inter-staff and intra-agency differences.

More serious than this however, is the fact that someone from the State Office of Economic Opportunity, which for a variety of reasons we believe to be Mr. Charlton, called the Fiscal Officer of this agency at his home and urged him to take fiscal files out of this office to his home to be handed over to the representative. Not only is this a very serious breach of ethics and propriety, but it seriously leads us to believe that the pattern of using Economic Opportunity funds to provide salaries for political hatchet men is not a thing of the past, as we had hoped. It also indicates a very grave lack of knowledge and sophistication on the part of your office's representative, since under the Public Access to Information rule, which applies to CAA's and has since the early days of the program, any formal request from a legitimate group or organization for such information would have to be honored. With this in mind, we can only assume that the action of the representative shows a great deal of naivety about the nature and legal requirements of this program; or worse, indicates a morality of self-interest.




25

R. Lewis Usher
15 October 1970
Page #2

I hope you will see fit to investigate this matter and to offer proper training and guidance to your field representatives as to the role and function of OEO funded SEOO representatives as called for by your OEO contract and other appropriate documents.

Sincerely yours,



REV. H. H. LUSK
Chairman of the Board



JAMES N. BOYLSON
Executive Director

cc: ✓ H. Rodger Betts, Regional Director
Office of Economic Opportunity


Robert LaFosso, Inter-Agency Coordinator

Chuck Stone, Field Representative

Percy Moore, President, CAL CAP Directors Association

Mearle Custer, Chairman, State OEO Advisory Committee

MENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
PITOL MALL
ENTO, CALIFORNIA 95314



Respond to:
1114 Channing Ave
Torrance, 90501

February 9, 1971

Mr. Ernest Sprinkles
Executive Director
Economic and Youth Opportunities
Agency of Greater Los Angeles
314 West Sixth Street
Los Angeles, California 90014

Dear Mr. Sprinkles:

On behalf of the State Office of Economic Opportunity, I would like to request a copy of all monitor reports for all EYOA programs for the last two years.

In addition, we would like a list of the names, addresses and telephone numbers of all EYOA and delegate agency board members and staff as well as a current copy of the EYOA organizational chart.

It is important that we receive the above by February 17, 1971. Thank you, in advance, for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Gil Archuletta
Administrative Assistant/Operations
Southern California

GA:js

cc: EYOA Board Members
C. Mack Hall
William L. Smith
Calvin Williams

COMMENTS INCLUDING DEGREE OF COOPERATION:

NAME OF DISTRICT SUPERVISOR _____

WAS HE CONTACTED? YES _____ NO _____

COMMENTS _____

VIII. ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAM

A. IF THIS IS A REFUNDING OF A CONTINUING PROGRAM, HAS IT WORKED TO DATE?

B. IS THE PROGRAM NECESSARY? DOES IT MEET AN ACKNOWLEDGED NEED SUBSTANTIATED BY DEMOGRAPHIC POVERTY DATA?

C. IS IT A DUPLICATION? (EXAMINE NON-OEO PROGRAMS IN THE AREA)

D. IS IT A PROGRAM THAT CAN, AND SHOULD, BE OPERATED BY ANOTHER AGENCY?

E. DOES THE PAST EXPERIENCE WITH THIS AGENCY OR THESE PEOPLE PROVIDE A BASIS FOR OPTIMISM REGARDING THE SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME OF THE PROGRAM?

F. HAS THERE BEEN A CONCERTED, SINCERE EFFORT TO MOBILIZE PRIVATE SECTOR RESOURCES?

G. DOES THE WORK PROGRAM SPELL OUT EXACTLY WHAT IS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED?

THE ABOVE ARE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ANALYSIS. EXPAND AS NECESSARY ON CONTINUATION SHEET.

X. SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS

A. AREAS FOR NEGOTIATION WHICH COULD IMPROVE QUALITY OF PROGRAM. INCLUDE WORK PLAN, MANAGEMENT, PERSONNEL, BUDGET, TRAINING NEEDS, ETC.

B. CAN STATE OEO RESOURCES HELP IMPROVE THE PROGRAM? WHO?
IN WHAT AREAS? HAS IT HELPED IN THE PAST?

C. NON-NEGOTIABLE CHANGES REQUIRED TO PREVENT GOVERNOR'S
VETO.

D. RECOMMENDED GOVERNOR'S ACTION:

APPROVAL _____ LAPSE _____ VETO _____

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

X. INSTRUCTIONS

A. WORDING OF GOVERNOR'S LETTER.

B. LETTER TO GRANTEE AND/OR OEO SUCH AS OFFERS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING NEEDS, NEGOTIATION POINTS AS REQUIRED.

C. MEMOS TO STATE OEO PERSONNEL. SPECIAL EMPHASIS TO CHAPTERS OF REPORT, REQUEST FOR TA OR STAP, ETC., AS REQUIRED.

ACTION PACKAGE REVIEW

ANALYST _____

DATE SUBMITTED _____

DESCRIBE CHANGES FROM INFORMATION PACKAGE USING PARAGRAPH NUMBERS ON
REVIEW FORM AS REFERENCED. USE AS CONTINUATION SHEET AS NEEDED.

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES

THE SECO AND THE GOVERNOR

Attachments

REF.

PAGE

LEWIS K. UHLER ltr to CARL EHMANN dtd 2/9/71 21

THE SECO AND THE GOVERNOR


Attachments

REF.
PAGE

LEWIS K. UHLER ltr to CARL EHMANN dtd 2/9/71 21

State of California

EMIL K. UHLER
DIRECTOR



RONALD REAGA
GOVERNOR

Office of Economic Opportunity
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
800 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO 95814
916 445-9670 OR 445-7011

February 9, 1971

Mr. Carl Ehman
Regional Administrator, VISTA
Office of Economic Opportunity
100 McAllister Street
San Francisco, California 94102

Dear Mr. Ehman:

The State Office of Economic Opportunity has completed its review of the VISTA Proposal CA-31-224-0, to assign twenty (20) VISTA volunteers to the Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County, San Jose, California.

Our recommendations to the Governor are as follows:

That six (6) VISTA volunteers, all of them lawyers, be assigned to the Legal Aid Society, but only under the following conditions:

1. That VISTA attorneys work on individual service cases only and not engage in any other work described in the project proposal.
2. That no VISTAs be assigned to the Mexican-American Community Service Agency (MACSA), and that they be assigned as follows:

Model Cities - 2
East Side - 2
Alviso - 1
Gilroy - 1 (Location to be worked out
between ourselves and Mr. Manley.)

3. That VISTA volunteers refrain totally from draft counseling.

Mr. Carl Ehman


-2-

February 9, 1971

4. That no funding be granted for a VISTA Supervisor, and that supervision of the VISTA attorneys be handled exclusively by 3 volunteer members of the Santa Clara County Bar Association, to be appointed by the President of that organization. An agreement to that effect has been reached with the President of SCCBA, Mr. Mark Thomas, who will also instruct said volunteer supervisors to screen any and all legal cases being considered by the VISTA attorneys and to meet with their assigned VISTA volunteers on a weekly basis.

You may submit the final letter for Governor's approval.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Lewis K. Uhler", written in a cursive style.

LEWIS K. UHLER
Director

THE SEOO AND OTHER STATE AGENCIES

Attachments

	REF.
	<u>PAGE</u>
THOMAS DUFFY memo to LEWIS K. UHLER dtd 2/3/71	24
BUDGET ANALYSIS	25

Memorandum

Honorable Lewis K. Unter
Director
State Office of Economic Opportunity
800 Capitol Mall

William Underhill
100-100000-15
Date : February 3, 1971

Subject: Project V

Model Cities Liaison Group

On behalf of Lieutenant Governor Reinecke, I have held conversations with you about the desirability and feasibility of a pilot project designed to develop and test concepts of merging Community Action Programs with the Model Cities program in selected localities. We have agreed, I believe, that this idea, which we call "Project V", should be pursued. In our discussions, we have developed the understandings that: the commitment of the Model Cities Program and its participating citizens to act as part of and in cooperation with its duly elected local general government is a desirable model on which to base the proposed project; Project V should be under the general leadership of the Lieutenant Governor; the cooperation of the local government involved and the local citizen participation elements of both programs is necessary to the project's success; and we will each assign staff to conduct joint studies of Project V.

Accordingly, Mr. Leonard Down from your office and Miss JoAnn Barrett of mine have begun to explore the areas of similarity and dissimilarity of the OEO and Model Cities programs in the field, the possible obstacles which we may have to face, and methods of implementing Project V. These studies, as far as they have gone, lead me to believe that Project V is both desirable and feasible as a pilot project in one or two carefully selected locations. They also lead me to believe that the project will require the active support of the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity and Model Cities Administration, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. For these reasons, the Lieutenant Governor has directed me to discuss Project V with Mr. Carlucci, OEO, and Assistant Secretary Hyde, MCA/HUD, when I am in Washington next week, and to attempt to obtain their support.

Project V is apparently about to begin. In order to give it a firm foundation, I am asking that you concur on the facts as stated and that you agree to this in a memo of understanding.

Thomas N. Duffy
THOMAS N. DUFFY
Chief

[Signature]
Per, [Signature]

Date

Department of Human Resources Development—Continued

The program will have 25 camps in operation during the current year. It proposes to expand by two additional sites in fiscal year 1971-72 if the cooperation of local agencies in site acquisition and development can be gained. Site selection is not firm at this time.

These camps will serve an estimated 2,687 families with 13,972 members in the current year. Contingent upon the establishment of two new campsites, occupancy by 3,177 family units with 16,520 members is projected for fiscal year 1971-72.

The housing fabrication element, operated by a nonprofit organization, will annually provide vocational training and training in other skills for 100 migrant farm laborers. Day care services are provided at all campsite locations. Three campsites offer infant care services. All such services are provided by local agencies.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, REVIEW, COORDINATION AND
INNOVATIVE ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

This program is carried out by the State Office of Economic Opportunity. The objectives of the program are (1) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in their operation of anti-poverty programs funded through O.E.O. grants, (2) to coordinate related state anti-poverty programs, (3) to mobilize the state resources relating to anti-poverty problems and (4) to advise and assist the national director of O.E.O. in these matters.

In addition to these objectives, the state O.E.O. office, as a condition of its grant, is required to perform the following duties:

(1) To act as the Governor's adviser on anti-poverty matters including his approval or disapproval of O.E.O. grants and contracts of assistance. In these cases, the Governor has three alternatives to follow during the 30-day period following receipt of the request:

- A. Acknowledge full approval. Qualified approvals are not accepted by Regional O.E.O. headquarters.
- B. Allow the 30-day period to lapse without comment, in which case the burden of approval rests with O.E.O. Washington.
- C. Disapprove. In this instance the director of O.E.O. Washington has the authority to reverse the Governor's disapproval action.

(2) To give priority to the mobilization and coordination of anti-poverty resources, particularly at the state level. In this function the office acts as special advocate for the participation of poor people in state government.

(3) To provide technical assistance to community action agencies (CAA) and other O.E.O. grantees.

(4) Act in an advisory capacity to O.E.O. regional offices on the equitable distribution of assistance between urban and rural areas.

The State Office of Economic Opportunity proposes a total expenditure of \$989,625, an increase of \$25,912 over the current year's estimate and \$585,165 over the amount originally budgeted last year. The entire increase in the 1971-72 request over 1970-71 occurs in the state funding of the office as federal funding remains at current-year levels. The

state funding is proposed to be increased from \$43,977 in the current year to \$69,889 in the budget year, an increase of 58 percent. This increase made during the current year was made administratively.

The State Office of Economic Opportunity does not, under the present federal funding and regulations process, become involved with direct assistance to the individual poor. This responsibility rests with the 42 Community Action Program grantees and the 32 single purpose O.E.O. grantees throughout the state. The state O.E.O. does have the authority and responsibility under Section 242 of the Economic Opportunity Act to monitor and evaluate the programs of the grantees. Its operations represent administrative costs.

It is in this evaluative area that the main thrust of the state office will be directed in fiscal year 1971-72. The office was granted additional funds by the federal O.E.O. in September of 1970. These funds were used to increase the office staff by eight new positions in the current year. These positions are carried over into the budget year. Thirteen professional positions are now assigned to the evaluation of this function. The state's level of funding has been increased by \$25,512. This amount, plus an in-kind match of \$52,252 is required to make up the total state funding requirement of the \$122,141.

The increase in staff was accompanied by a reorganization of the staff with an emphasis on in-depth analysis of the grantees' performance in meeting their stated goals. This analysis occupies a period of 105 days under ideal circumstances. It begins with the office staff participating in the "prereview" of the grant in company with the regional O.E.O. representatives and the grantee and ends with submission of the staff analysis and recommendation to the State Director of O.E.O. The director then has 15 days to review the staff analysis and forward his recommendations to the Governor. This process is complicated by the fact that each grant is reviewed as a separate entity. Each grant to a single agency usually has an expiration date not correlated with others. For instance, the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency of Greater Los Angeles has 13 grants totaling \$19,740,461, expiring on five different dates in 1971, while the Lassen-Modoc-Plumas-Tehama Community Action Agency, Inc., has two grants totaling \$221,001 expiring in 1971 on the same date. We understand that the office is endeavoring to seek the cooperation of the regional O.E.O. in adjusting expiration dates of grants to permit orderly processing at an even level throughout the year.

The evaluations of the community action programs by the state office are intended to cover every aspect of the grantee's program, such as budgeting, accountability for expenditures, management, etc., with the end view of improving the capability and efficiency of the grantee in meeting the goals stated in their grant. In essence, the purpose of the evaluations is to insure that these publicly funded activities are in fact reaching the poor for whom the programs are intended and are achieving the overall goal of breaking the cycle of poverty which afflicts a portion of the citizenry of the state.

Human Resources Development

Items 231-237

Department of Human Resources Development—Continued

The office also has the responsibility of review and recommendation for the Governor's consideration on the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) programs (of which there were 23 in calendar 1970) within the state. The office acting for the Governor in this instance is authorized to structure such programs and assistance in the manner that it believes will achieve the best results.

In addition to the eight positions discussed above, the state O.E.O. has the authority, by way of four 100 percent federal funded grants, to establish 21 other new positions in the current year. The total federal grant for these special projects is \$431,442 (no matching funds required). The purposes for which the four grants were made are as follows:

1. A management demonstration grant to assist local community action agencies in increasing their management capabilities. Authorizes six professional and two clerical positions.
2. A grant to provide for the monitoring of the Oakland Community Action Agency. Authorizes one professional and one clerical position.
3. A special technical assistance program for housing, economic development and local agency management. Authorizes four professional positions.
4. A volunteer coordinating grant. This grant has not been funded as yet and will authorize four professional and three clerical positions.

Table 6
O.E.O.—Staff and Workload Data

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
Grant review, O.E.O. grants	440	450	460
Grant totals in millions of dollars	\$74.5	\$75	\$75
Man-years of technical asst.	1.6	6.5	6.5
Number of agencies asst'd.	5	15	38
Assigned staff	15.2	25	25

Table 7
O.E.O.—Funded Grants Expiring in 1971 for 74 Agencies

	Grants	Dollar value
Multiple component grants ¹	81	\$41,227,505
Family planning	16	835,246
Head start	65	30,665,124
Education	7	2,324,430
Legal services	45	9,270,238
Youth programs	4	1,209,294
Indian	1	267,146
Summer programs	3	117,589
Narcotics program	1	689,220
Comprehensive health programs	8	5,834,530
Alcoholic program	7	1,027,811
Emergency food and medical services	24	16,942,716
Pilot programs	9	1,814,523
Resources mobilization	10	1,071,755
	281	\$113,297,127

¹ 15 percent of the total grant is allowed for administration.

Items 231-237

Human Resources Development

Table 8 indicates the proposed funding of the state O.E.O. activities for fiscal year 1971-72.

Table 8

State Office of Economic Opportunity Source of Proposed Funding and Staffing Fiscal Year 1971-72		
State-appropriated funds		
General Fund (20% state match including in kind) ¹	-----	\$69,889
Federal funds		
Five O.E.O. grants	-----	919,736
Total Support	-----	\$989,625
Administration management program costs prorated back to program	-----	(\$29,681)
Man-years Staffing and Funding by Grant		
25 State O.E.O. office grant (80% federal)	-----	\$488,564
8 Management demonstration grant (100% federal)	-----	162,170
2 Oakland monitor grant (100% federal)	-----	27,718
4 Special technical assistance grant (100% federal)	-----	114,814
7 Volunteer resources grant (100% federal)	-----	126,740
46	-----	\$919,736

¹ The total 20 percent state match is \$122,141. Thus an in kind match of not less than \$52,252 is required to assure the federal grant of \$488,564.

In view of the fact that this office has been more than doubled by administrative action since the last legislative approval and is providing review and approval over programs totaling \$113 million, *we believe the review reports rendered on these diverse local projects should be carefully examined to determine whether the reports are effective and whether the projects are effective. Pending this fuller review, we withhold any recommendation.*

COMMISSION ON AGING PROGRAM

The State Commission on Aging Program expenditure request is \$545,054, a reduction of 10.7 percent or \$65,265. The reduction is totally within the state funding. This results in a 30.6 percent reduction in commission support funds and a staff reduction of six positions or 54.5 percent.


The commission's program objective is the mobilization of the appropriate resources of all local communities within the state to meet the total needs of the approximately 12 million older citizens of the state. The commission, through its staff, accomplishes this objective by administering the Older American Act grants to communities sponsoring local programs for their senior citizens. Table 9 reflects the funding and staffing of the program for a five-year period.

The commission (12 members, of whom eight are Governor's appointees, and four are legislative members) approves all federal grants to local senior citizens programs on the basis of two criteria, the value and viability of the project and the availability of funds. All projects are funded and approved on an annual basis. The commission staff reviews the proposed programs, insures that an accounting system is installed, trains the local personnel, and aids in the conduct of seminars and other statewide activities pertinent to the program.

THE SEOO AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT
AND COMMUNITY GROUPS

Attachments

	REF. <u>PAGE</u>
WELFARE STATISTICS	28
AGING INFORMATION REQUEST	28
GOLDEN OPPORTUNITIES	28
FUND RAISING IDEAS	28



V. DILLER
103

RONALD L. RAGAN
GOVERNOR

Office of Economic Opportunity
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
800 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO 95814
916 445-3670 OR 445-7011

February 24, 1971

TO: CAA Directors or Planners
Mr. Charles Wilson
Planning
Office of Economic Opportunity, Region IX

FROM: Leonard H. Down *Leonard H. Down*
Staff Assistant for Planning
Office of Economic Opportunity

SUBJECT: Aid Recipients in California

The attached represent the latest figures available for aid recipients by counties in California. You may find them useful in your planning activities.

LHD:nc

Attachments

TABLE 3a. ADULT PROGRAMS
CASH LOADS BY PROGRAM STATUS

November 1970

County	Aged persons			Blind persons			Potentially self-supporting blind persons			Disabled persons		
	Total	Cash grant	Medical assist. only	Total	Cash grant	Medical assist. only	Total	Cash grant	Medical assist. only	Total	Cash grant	Medical assist. only
All counties	373,543	319,775	53,768	14,605	13,642	963	217	216	1	195,721	182,337	13,384
Alameda	17,690	14,647	3,043	1,042	974	68	9	9	0	11,603	10,780	823
Alameda	9	9	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	0
Alameda	305	259	46	17	10	7	0	0	0	10	73	7
Alameda	3,609	3,222	387	114	106	8	0	0	0	1,266	1,209	57
Alameda	391	320	71	11	9	2	0	0	0	126	115	13
Alameda	352	283	49	4	4	0	0	0	0	135	119	16
Alameda	7,771	5,940	1,831	357	344	36	11	11	0	5,272	4,936	336
Alameda	339	317	22	19	19	0	0	0	0	251	244	7
Alameda	952	684	106	24	24	0	2	2	0	436	399	37
Alameda	12,157	10,681	1,476	433	410	23	2	2	0	6,286	5,870	416
Alameda	490	386	102	14	13	1	0	0	0	153	127	26
Alameda	2,145	1,882	264	80	78	2	1	1	0	1,294	1,232	62
Alameda	2,283	2,116	167	94	89	5	0	0	0	1,609	966	43
Alameda	413	358	55	9	8	1	1	1	0	151	145	6
Alameda	8,269	7,676	641	266	276	10	0	0	0	4,340	4,120	220
Alameda	1,661	1,453	208	69	62	7	2	2	0	808	754	54
Alameda	1,024	938	86	27	23	4	1	1	0	371	358	13
Alameda	350	328	62	26	22	4	0	0	0	172	155	17
Alameda	138,539	118,268	20,271	5,063	4,783	301	51	51	0	74,010	68,757	5,253
Alameda	1,837	1,687	150	67	60	1	0	0	0	1,059	1,020	39
Alameda	1,714	1,293	421	53	42	11	0	0	0	866	781	105
Alameda	265	182	24	7	5	2	0	0	0	49	42	7
Alameda	1,379	1,216	163	36	34	2	0	0	0	609	572	36
Alameda	2,630	2,301	329	125	112	7	0	0	0	1,403	1,330	73
Alameda	209	181	28	11	10	1	0	0	0	67	62	5
Alameda	50	48	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	0
Alameda	3,255	2,686	569	142	129	13	2	1	1	1,813	1,613	200
Alameda	1,684	1,357	327	73	64	9	0	0	0	728	667	61
Alameda	938	803	135	30	25	5	0	0	0	348	330	18
Alameda	12,037	9,670	2,367	405	377	28	9	9	0	4,677	4,203	474
Alameda	1,559	1,337	212	51	49	2	0	0	0	686	663	23
Alameda	367	310	57	13	13	0	0	0	0	151	140	11
Alameda	11,566	10,329	1,239	406	381	25	0	0	0	5,172	4,928	244
Alameda	12,193	10,396	1,797	543	501	42	20	20	0	7,588	7,061	527
Alameda	437	332	54	18	16	2	0	0	0	149	131	18
Alameda	15,279	13,240	2,039	680	640	40	1	1	0	6,507	5,977	530
Alameda	18,553	16,032	2,521	897	758	49	39	39	0	9,182	8,530	602
Alameda	18,553	15,529	3,124	805	750	55	14	14	0	13,025	12,240	785
Alameda	6,880	7,642	1,033	353	335	18	3	3	0	4,426	4,122	304
Alameda	2,723	2,451	277	67	58	9	2	2	0	1,110	1,017	63
Alameda	5,401	4,372	1,029	208	196	12	7	7	0	3,118	2,928	190
Alameda	3,342	3,056	476	123	116	7	9	9	0	1,737	1,487	250
Alameda	12,751	10,761	1,990	499	450	49	23	23	0	6,921	6,366	525
Alameda	3,713	3,152	566	143	122	21	0	0	0	1,195	1,112	83
Alameda	2,182	1,961	221	80	71	9	1	1	0	1,036	990	46
Alameda	50	47	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	20	1
Alameda	886	763	123	25	22	3	0	0	0	376	350	26
Alameda	2,000	1,656	342	84	79	5	3	3	0	1,134	1,032	102
Alameda	4,699	3,976	723	184	175	9	0	0	0	2,068	1,864	224
Alameda	6,397	5,895	601	204	200	8	1	1	0	2,977	2,879	100
Alameda	855	855	0	33	30	3	0	0	0	377	377	0
Alameda	860	778	82	27	23	4	0	0	0	339	320	19
Alameda	185	163	23	8	7	1	0	0	0	69	57	12
Alameda	7,203	6,706	497	272	257	15	1	1	0	3,353	3,127	166
Alameda	654	569	85	7	6	1	0	0	0	253	244	9
Alameda	5,064	4,170	892	176	164	12	0	0	0	1,953	1,925	18
Alameda	1,754	1,524	234	56	49	7	2	2	0	815	732	69
Alameda	1,000	951	54	45	41	0	0	0	0	514	491	12

Data estimated, report(s) not received

TABLE 3B. FAMILY AND CHILDREN PROGRAMS
CASELOADS BY PROGRAM STATUS

November 1970

County	Families with dependent children — family groups and unemployed cases								Children in boarding homes and institutions		
	Total families	Total children in families	Cash grant family groups ^{a/}		Cash grant unemployed cases		Certified for medical assistance only		Total	Cash grant	Med. assist. only
			Families	Children	Families	Children	Families	Children			
All counties	442,675	1,081,146	356,545	871,409	54,206	156,875	31,924	55,871	43,574	33,659	9,515
Alameda	30,219	69,562	23,038	53,395	4,060	10,398	3,121	5,768	1,819	1,393	426
Alpine	12	38	12	38	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
Amador	80	204	68	156	1	4	11	44	10	8	2
Butte	1,965	4,866	1,567	3,837	237	715	161	334	198	161	37
Calaveras	196	459	146	346	26	67	24	46	7	6	1
Colusa	146	365	126	310	0	0	20	55	18	12	0
Contra Costa	13,267	30,203	10,714	24,957	1,836	4,015	715	1,231	1,112	601	311
Del Norte	367	709	264	623	28	65	15	21	44	41	3
El Dorado	911	2,093	703	1,655	136	314	72	124	76	72	4
Fresno	12,768	37,491	10,551	29,464	1,358	6,167	879	1,860	802	622	180
Glenn	237	559	171	421	21	43	45	95	47	45	2
Humboldt	2,290	5,383	1,693	3,995	341	882	256	505	213	175	36
Imperial	1,954	5,663	1,616	4,776	214	624	124	263	170	156	20
Inyo	186	437	160	359	15	51	11	27	39	35	4
Kern	7,316	19,798	6,379	17,759	269	1,124	668	915	831	769	60
Kings	1,693	5,453	1,333	3,500	468	1,677	97	276	124	101	23
Lake	459	1,071	358	821	80	203	21	47	28	25	3
Lassen	267	597	208	463	32	64	27	70	16	14	2
Los Angeles	176,625	430,495	147,272	360,765	17,679	52,453	11,075	17,277	20,720	15,195	5,525
Madera	1,249	3,617	968	2,678	222	641	59	98	85	77	8
Marin	2,437	4,776	1,776	3,384	308	626	353	766	339	169	160
Mariposa	49	111	39	95	6	14	2	2	8	8	0
Mendocino	1,250	2,752	955	2,064	204	501	91	187	207	184	23
Merced	3,161	8,593	2,522	6,799	408	1,466	171	326	171	152	19
Modoc	125	298	101	225	18	60	6	13	7	7	0
Monterey	40	100	31	71	2	10	7	19	3	3	0
Monterey	4,200	9,716	3,388	8,146	316	917	496	653	374	282	92
Napa	1,082	2,408	957	2,067	28	90	97	251	134	110	24
Nevada	459	1,053	359	828	51	119	49	106	38	35	3
Orange	15,668	36,743	12,051	28,869	1,755	5,064	1,862	2,810	1,150	681	569
Pacer	1,708	3,924	1,321	3,021	303	761	84	142	129	120	9
Plumas	237	568	183	431	31	74	23	63	18	18	0
Riverside	9,549	26,387	7,777	21,155	1,059	3,920	713	1,312	968	805	163
Sacramento	16,545	40,396	12,242	29,181	2,956	7,709	1,347	3,505	1,212	952	260
San Benito	333	897	264	703	17	71	52	123	17	13	4
San Bernardino	15,443	40,410	12,552	32,757	1,790	5,365	1,101	2,268	1,053	1,043	10
San Diego	22,707	52,040	17,412	40,579	3,325	8,792	1,970	2,669	2,241	1,825	416
San Francisco	19,609	42,256	15,914	35,950	1,683	3,892	1,403	2,416	2,575	2,295	279
San Joaquin	8,064	19,690	6,365	15,167	1,177	3,709	542	1,003	569	425	141
San Luis Obispo	1,726	4,243	1,334	3,154	264	814	128	275	186	159	27
San Mateo	6,085	15,297	5,494	12,600	750	1,873	431	824	918	502	416
Santa Barbara	4,338	10,553	3,413	8,403	477	1,306	448	844	252	247	5
Santa Clara	19,647	48,867	14,943	36,354	4,074	11,345	630	1,188	1,714	1,416	298
Santa Cruz	2,230	4,761	1,839	3,963	125	231	266	567	221	191	30
Shasta	2,587	6,032	1,887	4,324	35	1,370	165	338	149	118	31
Sierra	14	23	14	23	0	0	0	0	4	4	0
Siskiyou	427	1,010	339	797	53	141	35	72	45	40	5
Solano	3,947	9,335	3,064	7,265	719	1,834	164	236	342	296	44
Sonoma	5,240	12,401	3,660	8,395	1,153	3,108	427	897	444	397	47
Stanislaus	5,782	15,134	4,482	11,196	1,098	3,666	200	772	518	443	75
Sutter	780	1,878	542	1,317	188	482	58	79	44	38	6
Tehama	456	1,205	371	991	29	87	56	127	41	40	1
Trinity	138	351	80	196	38	109	20	46	8	3	5
Tulare	6,381	16,971	4,973	13,694	1,106	4,322	302	755	360	312	43
Tuolumne	357	792	286	640	28	72	43	80	57	51	6
Yuba	4,781	12,567	3,583	10,607	386	1,256	514	1,004	352	334	45
Yolo	1,517	4,516	1,316	3,228	294	879	212	409	160	141	21
Yuba	1,441	3,487	929	2,229	415	1,107	47	167	95	82	11

^{a/} Includes all cash grant families except those eligible because of unemployment of a parent.

• Data estimated; report(s) not received.

NOTIFICATION

Mr. Neil Bodine
Executive Director
Stanislaus County Community
Action Commission
1317 "I" Street
Modesto, California 95354

Date : February 24, 1971

Subject: National Council on
Aging Conference -
Update of Information

Lewis K. Unler, Director
Office of Economic Opportunity

LKU

The National Council on Aging has requested the assistance of the California CAPs in updating their current files. Their purpose is a current contact list for their March 27, 1971, annual conference in Washington, D.C.

Please send an updated list of all programs for the elderly (age 60 or over) to the following:

National Council on Aging, Inc.
1828 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

An information format is attached for your reference.

LKU:plg

Attachment

cc: Mrs. Beatrice Schiffman

GOLDEN STATE OPPORTUNITY REPORT

California State Office of Economic Opportunity


Lewis K. Uhler, Director

Sacramento, California -- January, 1971

PLEASE RETURN TO LIBRARY

Rural County Community Action Program Directors Attend State Resources Conference

See story on Page 2



Lewis K. Uhler, State Director of OEO, addressing rural community action program leaders at the Mansion Inn in Sacramento.