

U.S. Department of Labor

Office of Inspector General—Office of Audit

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING
ADMINISTRATION



RECOVERY ACT: SLOW PACE PLACING WORKERS INTO JOBS JEOPARDIZES EMPLOYMENT GOALS OF THE GREEN JOBS PROGRAM

Date Issued: September 30, 2011
Report Number: 18-11-004-03-390

BRIEFLY...

Highlights of Report Number: 18-11-004-03-390, issued to the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training.

WHY READ THE REPORT

At the request of the Honorable Charles E. Grassley, then Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Finance, the Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Audit, initiated an audit of the Recovery Act Green Jobs Program. Specifically, Senator Grassley requested an audit of Recovery Act funds spent on Green Jobs, and the definition used by the Department for what constitutes a green job, as well as the duration of the jobs created pursuant to the funds expended.

The Recovery Act provided \$500 million for research, labor exchange, and job training projects that prepare workers for careers in energy efficiency and renewable energy as described in Section 171(e)(1)(B) of the Workforce Investment Act. The Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (ETA), awarded these funds under different types of competitive grant programs to (1) train and prepare individuals for careers in "green jobs;" and (2) collect, analyze, and disseminate labor market information.

WHY OIG CONDUCTED THE AUDIT

Our audit objectives were to answer the following questions:

- 1) How has ETA defined green jobs?
- 2) What is the status of funds expended, and how have grant funds been used?
- 3) To what extent have ETA and grantees reported achieving performance targets for training and placement of workers, and employment retention?

READ THE FULL REPORT

To view the report, including the scope, methodology, and full agency response, go to: <http://www.oig.dol.gov/public/reports/oa/2011/18-11-004-03-390.pdf>.

September 2011

RECOVERY ACT: SLOW PACE PLACING WORKERS INTO JOBS JEOPARDIZES EMPLOYMENT GOALS OF THE GREEN JOBS PROGRAM

WHAT OIG FOUND

The definition ETA used for green jobs is jobs associated with products and services that use renewable energy resources, reduce pollution, and conserve natural resources. The definition used by ETA to award grants was in compliance with the requirements of the Recovery Act.

Of the \$500 million provided, ETA retained \$9.9 million for services such as program administration and technical assistance, and awarded \$490.1 million as follows: \$435.4 million for three training programs, \$48.9 million for labor market information, and \$5.8 million to develop capacity for training programs. Grantees have reported expending \$162.8 million (33 percent) of the amounts awarded, with about 73 percent of the grant time having elapsed. As of June 30, 2011, \$327.3 million remained unexpended. Moreover, the rate of training grant expenditures for the most recent period has decreased.

ETA and grantees have reported achieving limited performance targets for serving and placing workers. Grantees have reported serving 52,762 (42 percent) of the targeted 124,893 participants with 61 percent of training grant periods having elapsed and have reported placing 8,035 participants (10 percent) into employment out of the target of 79,854 participants. The rates at which grantees are achieving their performance goals have been increasing. However, with 61 percent of the training grant periods elapsed and only 10 percent of participants entered employment, there is no evidence that grantees will effectively use the funds and deliver targeted employment outcomes by the end of the grant periods.

WHAT OIG RECOMMENDED

We recommend that the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training evaluate the Green Jobs program; and in so doing, obtain an estimate of funds each grantee will realistically spend given the current demand for green job-related skills and the job market for green jobs. Any of the remaining \$327.3 million of funds determined not to be needed should be recouped as soon as practicable and to the extent permitted by law so they can be available for other purposes.

In response to the draft report, the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training disagreed with OIG's conclusion and expects performance to significantly increase. ETA's intention is that all funds will be expended by September 30, 2013, or reclaimed to the extent permitted by law, as required by OMB.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

Assistant Inspector General’s Report	1
Results In Brief	2
Objective 1 — How has ETA defined green jobs?	5
<i>The definition ETA used for green jobs is jobs associated with products and services that use renewable energy resources, reduce pollution, and conserve natural resources.</i>	5
Objective 2 — What is the status of funds expended, and how have grant funds been used?	8
<i>Of the \$490.1 million of grants awarded, \$162.8 million (33 percent) had been spent while 73 percent of the grant periods had elapsed as of June 30, 2011.</i>	8
Objective 3 — To what extent have ETA and grantees reported achieving performance targets for training and placement of workers, and employment retention?	10
<i>ETA and grantees have reported achieving limited performance targets for serving, placing and retaining workers; and risk not delivering targeted outcomes timely.</i>	10
Recommendations	15
Exhibits	
Exhibit 1 Grant Awards, Expenditures, and Training Outcomes for All Grants as of June 30, 2011	19
Exhibit 2 Proposed Deliverables and Reported Status for Sampled State LMI Grants as of June 30, 2011	39
Exhibit 3 Proposed Deliverables and Reported Status for Sampled Green Capacity Grants as of June 30, 2011	47
Appendices	
Appendix A Background	57
Appendix B Objectives, Scope, Methodology, and Criteria	59
Appendix C Acronyms	63
Appendix D ETA Response to Draft Report	65
Appendix E Acknowledgements	73

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

U.S. Department of Labor

Office of Inspector General
Washington, D.C. 20210



September 30, 2011

Assistant Inspector General's Report

Ms. Jane Oates
Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act), signed by President Obama on February 17, 2009, provided \$500 million for research, labor exchange, and job training projects that prepare workers for careers in energy efficiency and renewable energy as described in Section 171(e)(1)(B) of the Workforce Investment Act. The purpose of the Recovery Act was to assist those most impacted by the recession and to expend funds as quickly as possible consistent with prudent management. The Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (ETA), awarded these funds under different types of competitive grant programs to (1) train and prepare individuals for careers in "green jobs;" and (2) collect, analyze, and disseminate labor market information.

We conducted an audit of ETA's Green Jobs program as part of our audit oversight responsibilities and in response to a request from the Honorable Charles E. Grassley, then Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Finance. Specifically, Senator Grassley requested an audit of Recovery Act funds spent on Green Jobs, and the definition used by the Department for what constitutes a green job, as well as the duration of the jobs created pursuant to the funds expended. To this end, we developed the following audit objectives:

1. How has ETA defined green jobs?
2. What is the status of funds expended, and how have grant funds been used?
3. To what extent have ETA and grantees reported achieving performance targets for training and placement of workers, and employment retention?

The scope of the audit covered the \$500 million authorized by the Recovery Act and awarded by ETA. It included grantees' reported data to ETA as of June 30, 2011 (the most recent period available). ETA awarded these grants in December 2009 and January 2010, with grant end dates spanning from November 2010 through January

2013. Grantees have been authorized by ETA to spend \$490.1 million. As of June 30, 2011, grantees have reported expenditures of \$162.8 million (33 percent) of the authorized amount.

We selected a statistical sample of 87 grants (46 percent) to review, totaling \$231 million (47 percent) from the universe of 189 grants. The grants were reviewed to determine the period of performance, types of training, milestones and outcomes. We reviewed Quarterly Financial Reports to determine the status of funds expended, Grants E-Management System (GEMS) to determine the extent of monitoring performed, and interviewed ETA national and regional officials. For training grants, we reviewed Quarterly Performance Reports to obtain reported performance outcomes related to training and job placement. For non-training grants, we reviewed Quarterly Narrative Reports to gain an understanding of how grant funds were used.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

RESULTS IN BRIEF

The definition used by ETA to award grants was in compliance with the requirements of the Recovery Act because it was derived from the Green Jobs Act of 2007 that covered the seven Green Job industries, and broadly included jobs that clean and enhance our environment. The definition ETA used for green jobs is jobs associated with products and services that use renewable energy resources, reduce pollution, and conserve natural resources. Not all green jobs so defined are new or unique occupations. Some green jobs build upon existing occupations.

One-Third of Funds Were Expended

Of the \$500 million provided, ETA retained the remaining \$9.9 million for services such as program administration and technical assistance, and awarded \$490.1 million as follows: \$435.4 million for three training programs, \$48.9 million for labor market information, and \$5.8 million to develop capacity.¹ Grantees have reported expending \$162.8 million (33 percent) of the amounts awarded, with about 73 percent of the grant time having elapsed. As of June 30, 2011, \$327.3 million remained unexpended. Moreover, the rate of training grant expenditures for the most recent period has decreased. Grantees reported expenditures for training and non-training grants as follows:

¹ This includes the purchase of equipment, curriculum development, and the hiring of additional staff in order to build the capacity for Green Jobs training.

- Training grantees reported expenditures of \$126.1 million (29 percent) of the amount awarded with 61 percent of the grant periods having elapsed;
- Non-training grantees reported expenditures of \$36.7 million (67 percent) of the amount awarded although 95 percent of the grant periods have elapsed. In addition, 77 percent of the sampled State labor market information and capacity grantees have received extensions of the period of performance.

Limited Performance Targets Achieved

ETA and grantees have reported achieving limited performance targets for serving and placing workers. Grantees have reported serving 52,762 (42 percent) of the targeted 124,893 participants with 61 percent of training grant periods having elapsed, and have reported placing 8,035 participants (10 percent) into employment out of the target of 79,854 participants 17 months after the grants were awarded. Of the 52,762 participants served, grantees reported that 20,818 (39 percent) were individuals who already have jobs and enrolled in training in order to retain their jobs, obtain new work, or otherwise upgrade their skills. In addition, according to interviews conducted early in 2011 with regional officials, grantees have expressed concerns that jobs have not materialized and that job placements have been fewer than expected for this point in the grant program.

Training grantees reported placing 8,035 participants and have reported 1,336 participants retained employment for at least 6 months, or 2 percent of the targeted employment retention of 69,717 participants. The low retention rate may be attributable in part to the timing of placement. For participants placed in the quarter ending June 30, 2011, retention information will not be available until the quarter ending December 31, 2011. Nevertheless, the low rate raises concerns that original goals may not be reached before the grant periods expire.

ETA officials stated that there was no linear relationship between grant periods elapsed and grant expenditures and outcomes, but indicated that they expect performance to significantly increase over time due to an initial lag during the start-up phase of a grant. However, ETA could not demonstrate that grantees were on target to meet grant outcomes nor was there a plan to ensure that they could. The rate at which grantees are achieving their performance goals have shown increases from December 31, 2010 to June 30, 2011. For the latest three quarters, grantees reported participants that completed training were 5, 7, and 11 percent of the targeted 96,658 participants; and participants that entered employment were 1, 3, and 5 percent of the targeted 79,854 participants. However, with 61 percent of the training grant periods elapsed, only 10 percent of participants entered employment. The performance period end date for a majority of the training grants is January 2012, or 7 months from the reporting period used in this report of June 30, 2011². At this point, there is no evidence that grantees

² For Pathways and ETP that make up the majority (65 percent) of the grants, the grant end date is January 2012. For SESP grants, the grant end date is January 2013.

will effectively use the funds and deliver targeted employment outcomes by the end of the grant periods. With no evidence to support grantees were on target to meet outcomes, grantees may not assist those most impacted by the recession and achieve performance outcomes such as placements within the time limits set by grant agreements.

We recommend that the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training evaluate the Green Jobs program; and in so doing, obtain an estimate of funds each grantee will realistically spend given the current demand for green job-related skills and the job market for green jobs. Any of the remaining \$327.3 million of funds determined not to be needed should be recouped as soon as practicable and to the extent permitted by law so they can be available for other purposes.

ETA's RESPONSE

In response to the draft report, the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training stated that ETA disagrees with OIG's conclusion and expects performance to significantly increase following an initial lag during the standard start-up phase of the grants. ETA has put in place measures to monitor progress and provide technical assistance to help ensure success for grantees at risk of not meeting their outcomes. Furthermore, ETA suggested that when assessing the financial status of the grants, obligations should be used as a primary indicator in addition to expenditures. Regarding unexpended grant funds, ETA refers to OMB's memorandum dated September 15, 2011, stating that ETA has obligated all of its Recovery Act funds and does not intend to return any money to the U.S. Treasury. ETA's intention is that all funds will be expended by September 30, 2013, as required by OMB. If a grantee has not expended all Recovery Act funds by September 30, 2013, those funds will be reclaimed. ETA's response is included in its entirety in Appendix D.

OIG CONCLUSION

ETA did not provide evidence to support its assertion that grantees will effectively use the funds and deliver targeted employment outcomes by the end of the grant periods. With time periods elapsed on training grants from approximately 50 to 75 percent, and non-training grants nearing completion or completed, performance outcomes remain low. The use of expenditures along with performance outcomes depicts an accurate snapshot of the current status of the green jobs program. While the effort to assist grantees with technical assistance is a positive step, we remain concerned with the slow pace of meeting performance targets. Finally, we note that OMB's recent memo also directed Agencies to accelerate the spending of remaining Recovery Act discretionary grant funds while achieving core programmatic objectives. We believe this guidance is consistent with the conclusions and recommendations in our report.

Where appropriate, we made technical clarifications in the report based on ETA's response to the draft report.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Objective 1 — How has ETA defined green jobs?

The definition ETA used for green jobs is jobs associated with products and services that use renewable energy resources, reduce pollution, and conserve natural resources.

The definition used by ETA to award grants was in compliance with the requirements of the Recovery Act because it was derived from the Green Jobs Act of 2007 that covered the seven Green Job industries, and broadly included jobs that clean and enhance our environment. Not all green jobs so defined are new or unique occupations. Some green jobs build upon existing occupations. For example, existing skills are modified to prepare workers for careers in the energy efficiency, renewable energy sectors and for other green jobs, such as power plant operators; electrical engineers; heating, ventilating and air conditioning (HVAC) mechanics and installers; roofers and construction managers.

For purposes of these grants, Employment and Training Administration (ETA) defined energy efficiency and renewable energy as follows: 1) Energy Efficiency – programs aimed at mitigating the use of energy, reducing harmful emissions, and decreasing overall energy consumption; and 2) Renewable Energy – electric energy generated from solar, wind, biomass, landfill gas, ocean (including tidal, wave, current, and thermal), geothermal, municipal solid waste, or new hydroelectric generation capacity achieved from increased efficiency or additions of new capacity at an existing hydroelectric project.

In addition to the Green Jobs Act of 2007, the definition used by ETA to award Green Jobs grants was derived from the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and information obtained from ETA-funded Occupational Information Network (O*NET),³ a database of occupational requirements and worker attributes. (For definitions, see the Background section of the report.) The definition covered the seven industries required by the Recovery and Workforce Investment Acts.

Green Jobs training grants were awarded in the following areas:

- State Energy Sector Partnership (SESP) provides participants technical and occupational skills in the green jobs industries through state workforce investment boards in partnership with state and local agencies;

³ O*NET is a database of occupational requirements and worker attributes. It describes occupations in terms of the skills and knowledge required on how the work is performed, and typical work settings. It can be used by businesses, educators, job seekers, human resource professionals, and the publicly funded Workforce Investment System to help meet the talent needs of our competitive global economy.

- Pathways out of Poverty (Pathways) was for projects that provide training and placement services as a pathway out of poverty and into employment; and
- Energy Training Partnership (ETP) was to assist workers impacted by national energy and environmental policy, individuals in need of updated training related to Green Jobs industries, and unemployed workers.

Grants were also awarded to develop labor market information, and build capacity through purchasing equipment, developing curriculum and hiring additional staff.

ETA did not specify the percentage of funds or number of grants that would be awarded for each sector within the energy efficiency and renewable energy industries. Our analysis of a statistically selected sample of 40 training grants disclosed that the majority of the proposed training was in 1) energy-efficient building, construction, and retrofit industries; and 2) renewable electric power industries. Figure 1 provides examples of occupations and tasks pertaining to the seven Green Jobs industries and the number of sampled grantees who proposed training in each of the seven sectors.

Figure 1: Examples of Occupations and Tasks Pertaining to the Seven Green Jobs Industries

Industry	Tasks	Occupations	Number of Sampled Grantees Proposing Training *
1. Energy-efficient building, construction and retrofits	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Air sealing 2. Insulation installation 3. Structural retrofitting and repair 4. Solar panel installation and maintenance 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Weatherization specialist 2. Green building carpenter 3. Green building facilities manager 4. Insulation workers 	34
2. Renewable electric power	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manufacturing and installing components of renewable energy industry equipment 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Solar, wind and Geo-thermal assemblers 2. Solar voltaic manufacturing technicians 3. Electricians, plumbers, and construction laborers as solar installers 4. Sheet metal, composite/ fiberglass technicians, welders, machinists for products to support renewable energy industry 	25
3. Energy efficient and advance drive train vehicle	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alternative fuel vehicles production 2. Servicing and operations of these vehicles 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hybrid and electric auto technician 2. Electric auto/truck battery technician 3. Alternative fuel automotive production workers 	7
4. Biofuels	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operations of a sump pump vehicle and oil tanker truck 2. Collection of vegetable oil 3. Distillation of oil such as the separation of oil to generate bio-diesel products 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Biofuels collection technician 2. Biofuels rendering technician 	10
5. Deconstruction and materials use industry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deconstruct buildings or recyclable products 2. Separate and condense waste materials 3. Operate pallet jacks, compression machine, and forklift 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deconstruction technician 2. Lead abatement technician 3. Material Handler 4. Quality Control Assistant 5. Waste Processor 6. Forklift Operator 	8
6. Energy efficiency assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct energy audits of buildings, building systems and process systems 2. Test, analyze and balance Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Energy Auditor 2. Testing, adjusting and balancing technician of HVAC systems 3. Energy Raters 	19
7. Manufacturers using environmentally sustainable processes and materials	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Read product work orders and plan work sequence 2. Operate machinery 3. Inspect work for defects and trouble-shoot problems with machinery 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sheet Metal Worker 2. Welder 3. Machine operator 4. Computer Numerical Control operator for manufacturing processes 5. Material Handler 6. Quality Control Technician 	11

* Grantees have proposed training in more than one sector.

Objective 2 — What is the status of funds expended, and how have grant funds been used?

Of the \$490.1 million of grants awarded, \$162.8 million (33 percent) had been spent while 73 percent of the grant periods had elapsed as of June 30, 2011.

ETA awarded grants totaling \$490.1 million through three training programs and two non-training programs, and retained the remaining \$9.9 million for services such as program administration and technical assistance. From the funds awarded, \$435.4 million was for training, \$48.9 million for labor market information, and \$5.8 million to develop capacity. The purpose and principle of the Recovery Act was “to assist those most impacted by the recession,” and to expend funds “as quickly as possible consistent with prudent management.” Although ETA obligated \$490.1 million, grantees only reported expenditures of \$162.8 million (33 percent) of the amounts awarded while 73 percent — a disproportionately greater amount — of the grant periods had already elapsed⁴. Moreover, training grants expenditures for the most recent quarter has decreased. For the quarter ending June 30, 2011, grantees reported expenditures of \$18 million (4 percent) of the \$435.4 million awarded. However, for the prior two quarters grantees reported expenditures of \$36.9 million (8 percent) and \$31.7 million (7 percent). As of June 30, 2011, \$327.3 million remained unexpended. This low level of expenditure is consistent with the slow pace of serving and placing workers into green jobs. See Exhibit 1 for Grant Awards, Expenditures and Training Outcomes for All Grants as of June 30, 2011.

Training Grants

The main focus of the Green Jobs program was to prepare individuals for careers in Green Jobs industries through three separate training areas: SESP, Pathways and ETP. Overall, the three areas received combined funding of \$435.4 million and have reported expenditures of \$126.1 million (29 percent) of the amount awarded while 61 percent of the grant periods had elapsed as of June 30, 2011.

- SESP grants were awarded to state workforce investment boards to provide participants the technical and occupational skills necessary to obtain industry recognized credentials.
- Pathways proposed to provide training and placement services to individuals who are living below or near the poverty level to provide a pathway into employment.
- ETP grants were to provide training and placement services in the energy efficiency and renewable energy industries for workers impacted by national energy and environmental policy. It provided services to individuals in need of

⁴ The grant period elapsed represents the weighted average of periods elapsed for sampled grants.

updated training related to the energy efficiency and renewable energy industries and unemployed workers.

Specific information about the amount awarded, expended and the time elapsed for each of the three areas follow in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Awards, Expenditures, and Time Elapsed for Training Grants

Grant Programs	Amount Awarded (millions)	Reported Expenditures (millions)	Percentage of Grant Award Expended	Percentage of Time Elapsed
SESP	\$187.9	\$24.5	13%	47%
Pathways	147.7	57.5	39%	71%
ETP	99.8	44.1	44%	75%
Total	\$435.4	\$126.1	29%	61%

The current rate that grantees have reported expending funds has decreased from the two prior quarters. For the quarter ending June 30, 2011, grantees reported expenditures of \$18 million, or 4 percent (16 percent annualized rate) of the \$435.4 million awarded. However, for the prior two quarters grantees reported expenditures of \$36.9 million, or 8 percent and \$31.7 million, or 7 percent (30 percent average annualized rate).

Non-Training Grants

ETA awarded non-training grants to provide State labor market information and build the capacity for Green Jobs training. Non-Training grants have combined funding of \$54.7 million and reported expenditures of \$36.7 million (67 percent) of the amount awarded. The non-training grants awarded in December 2009, include State Labor Market Information (State LMI) and Green Capacity Building (Green Capacity) grants. As of July 15, 2011, 36 out of 47 (77 percent) of non-training sampled grants had modifications extending the period of performance by an average of 5 months. As of June 30, 2011, time period elapsed factoring in these extensions was 95 percent, while 67 percent of the grant award had been expended. Proposed deliverables and reported status for sampled State LMI and Green Capacity grants are described in Exhibits 2 and 3. For a comparison of non-training grant awards, reported expenditures, and time elapsed, see Figure 3.

Figure 3: Grant Awards, Expenditures, and Time Elapsed for Non-Training Grants

Grant Programs	Amount Awarded (millions)	Reported Expenditures (millions)	Percentage of Grant Award Expended	Percentage of Time Elapsed
State LMI	\$48.9	\$31.5	64%	88%
Green Capacity	5.8	5.2	90%	100%
Total	\$54.7	\$36.7	67%	95%

State LMI grants were 18-month grants which were scheduled to end by May 2011. However, 20 of the 24 sampled grants received modifications in order to meet grant deliverables, extending the period of performance an average of 5 months, spanning from June 30 to December 31, 2011. Based on interviews conducted in early 2011, according to three of the six regional officials, some training grantees stated that the results of labor market information were needed to help identify the demand for green jobs so training in those areas could be enhanced. Although grantees had established areas of training in their proposals, it would be helpful had the results from the State LMI be disseminated quickly for grantees to take advantage of market information regarding training and be able to revise training where necessary. Extending these grants has further delayed the dissemination of labor market information that grantees need in order to improve training to enhance performance outcomes for green jobs.


While Green Capacity grants were 12-month grants originally scheduled to end by November 2010, 16 of 23 (70 percent) of the sampled grantees in this area had received grant modifications extending their period of performance an average of 5 months, spanning from December 31, 2010 to May 31, 2011. According to grantees' quarterly narrative progress reports, grant modifications to extend the grant periods were necessary to meet grant deliverables. As a result, the purchase of equipment, curriculum development and the hiring of additional staff to build the capacity of the green jobs program were delayed.

Objective 3 — To what extent have ETA and grantees reported achieving performance targets for training and placement of workers, and employment retention?

ETA and grantees have reported achieving limited performance targets for serving, placing and retaining workers; and risk not delivering targeted outcomes timely.

More than 2 years after the Recovery Act was signed and with 61 percent of the training grant periods elapsed, grantees reported serving 52,762 (42 percent) of the targeted 124,893 participants, and placing 8,035 (10 percent) of the targeted 79,854 participants. Moreover, grantees have reported 1,336 participants (2 percent) of the targeted 69,717 participants have retained employment for at least 6 months. It should be noted that the rates at which grantees are achieving their performance goals have shown increases

from December 31, 2010 to June 30, 2011. For the latest three quarters⁵, grantees reported participants that completed training were 5, 7, and 11 percent; and participants that entered employment were 1, 3, and 5 percent. However, with 61 percent of the training grant periods elapsed, and only 10 percent of participants entered employment, it does not show that they have gained much ground. At this rate, training programs are at risk of not delivering targeted outcomes by the end of the grant periods. ETA could not demonstrate that grantees were on target to meet grant outcomes, nor was there a plan to ensure that they could. With no evidence to support grantees were on target to meet outcomes, grantees may not assist those most impacted by the recession and achieve performance outcomes such as placements within the time limits set by grant agreements. (See Figure 4)



Grantees proposed serving 124,893 participants and reported serving 52,762 (42 percent). Of the 52,762 participants served, grantees reported that 20,818 (39 percent) were incumbent workers. These incumbent workers were individuals who already have jobs and enrolled in training in order to retain their jobs, obtain new work, or otherwise upgrade their skills, and are generally not reflected in employment outcomes. ETA could not identify how many incumbent workers grantees planned to serve, because grantees

⁵ The three quarters used were December 31, 2010, March 31, 2011, and June 30, 2011.

were not required to provide incumbent worker projections. However, ETA requires grantees to report the number of incumbent workers served.

While grantees proposed that 96,658 participants would complete training and 79,854 participants would be placed into employment, they have reported completing the training of 26,142 (27 percent) and placing 8,035 participants (10 percent) into employment. Of participants placed, 6,662 received training-related employment. According to interviews conducted early in 2011 with regional officials, grantees expressed concerns that green jobs had not materialized and job placements into unsubsidized employment had been much less than expected. In addition, the poor economic conditions have been a concern of the grantees.

The rates at which grantees are achieving their performance goals have increased. For the quarters ending December 31, 2010, March 31, 2011 and June 30, 2011, grantees reported participants that completed training were 5, 7, and 11 percent of the targeted 96,658 participants; and participants that entered employment were 1, 3, and 5 percent of the targeted 79,854 participants. However, with 61 percent of the training grant periods elapsed, and only 10 percent of participants entered employment, it does not show that they have gained much ground.

Grantees proposed employment retention of 69,717 participants. As of June 30, 2011, grantees have reported 1,336 participants (2 percent) have retained employment for at least 6 months, more than 2 years after the Recovery Act was signed and 17 months after the grants were awarded. The low retention rate may be attributed in part to the timing of placement. For participants placed in the quarter ending June 30, 2011, retention information will not be available until the quarter ending December 31, 2011. Still, the very small percentage of participants (2 percent) actually retained in jobs more than 6 months over the 2 years of the Recovery Act so far, is a trend that calls into doubt ETA's ability to achieve significant placement of workers into stable green jobs.

ETA awarded the green job grants, but it was up to the grantees to determine demand and the areas of training. However, we noted 11 out of 40 training grants (28 percent) did not contain evidence of market demand. This was further complicated by the fact that State LMI grants were to collect, analyze and disseminate labor market information pertaining to Green Jobs demand; however, results are still pending. Overall, grantees may face the risk of not delivering targeted outcomes timely.

Training Grant Outcomes

Overall, training grantees reported limited performance targets achieved. Training grant outcomes for the three programs are as follows in Figure 5:

Figure 5: Targeted and Reported Outcomes for Training Grants as of June 30, 2011

Grant Program	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
SESP						
Targeted:	62,844	58,933	49,536	42,817	28,554	37,998
Reported:	13,546	13,218	6,870	2,067	1,955	157
Achieved:	22%	22%	14%	5%	7%	0%
Pathways						
Targeted:	25,460	20,751	14,822	13,121	10,979	10,442
Reported:	15,639	11,954	5,802	2,553	1,905	360
Achieved:	61%	58%	39%	19%	17%	3%
ETP						
Targeted:	36,589	35,711	32,300	23,916	21,470	21,277
Reported:	23,577	21,455	13,470	3,415	2,802	819
Achieved:	64%	60%	42%	14%	13%	4%
All Training Grants						
Targeted:	124,893	115,395	96,658	79,854	61,003	69,717
Reported:	52,762	46,627	26,142	8,035	6,662	1,336
Achieved:	42%	40%	27%	10%	11%	2%

Of the three training programs, SESP goals were to complete training for 49,536 and place 42,817 participants into employment. However, with 47 percent of the grant periods having elapsed, grantees reported 6,870 participants (14 percent) having completed training, and 2,067 participants (5 percent) having been placed into employment.

Pathways goals were to complete training for 14,822 and place 13,121 participants into employment. However, with 71 percent of the grant periods having elapsed, grantees reported 5,802 participants (39 percent) having completed training, and 2,553 participants (19 percent) were placed into employment.

ETP goals were to complete training for 32,300 and place 23,916 participants into employment. However, with 75 percent of the grant periods having elapsed, grantees reported 13,470 participants (42 percent) having completed training and 3,415 participants (14 percent) being placed into employment.

Monitoring

As of June 30, 2011, grantees reported limited performance outcomes. ETA officials stated that there was no linear relationship between grant periods elapsed and grant expenditures and outcomes, but indicated that they expect performance to significantly increase over time due to an initial lag during the start-up phase of a grant. However, ETA could not demonstrate that grantees were on target to meet grant outcomes

despite the slow start. Furthermore, training Solicitations for Grant Applications required applicants provide projections and track outcomes for various categories, i.e. participants served, trained and entered employment. However, we found that 12 out of 97 grants (12 percent) did not provide projections for one or more of these outcome categories. Without these projected outcomes, ETA could not fully measure grantee performance or hold grantees accountable.

While ETA performed quarterly desk reviews, ETA's on-site monitoring was limited. For FY 2010 and through July 2011, only 17 of the 87 sampled grantees received on-site monitoring. According to interviews conducted, early in 2011 regional officials indicated that they were concerned there may be budget constraints that will prevent them from conducting planned on-site monitoring in FY 2011. Although, Green Capacity grants were scheduled to end in November 2010, ETA only performed on-site monitoring at 1 of the 23 grantees selected in the sample.

ETA officials stated technical assistance is provided to grantees. In February 2011, ETA implemented the Recovery Act Technical Assistance Plan, which included steps to support the success of green jobs program. ETA initiated a system to identify grantees that were slow to expend their grant funds or meet performance outcomes. The system is a needs assessment tool for use in determining the level of need for technical assistance, and prioritizing those needs. While the effort to assist grantees is a positive step, we are concerned with the slow pace of meeting performance targets. The performance period end date for a majority of the training grants is January 2012, or 7 months from the reporting period used in this report of June 30, 2011⁶. At this point, there is no evidence that grantees will effectively use the funds and deliver targeted employment outcomes by the end of the grant periods.

OIG identified ETA's potential problems with monitoring in an audit report⁷ issued September 30, 2010. The report stated that funds provided by the Recovery Act to ETA and used to monitor the green and health care grants would expire on September 30, 2010. As a result, ETA planned to assign monitoring of the 244 Recovery Act grants to existing non-Recovery Act staff, but these employees already had full workloads. The report recommended ETA take actions to continue to identify and prioritize workloads and funding levels to ensure the agency can adequately monitor these grants.

⁶ For Pathways and ETP that make up the majority (65 percent) of the grants, the grants' end dates are January 2012. For SESP grants the end date is January 2013.

⁷ Recovery Act: Employment and Training Administration Grant Issuance And Monitoring Policies And Procedures For Discretionary Grants Including Green Jobs Are Comprehensive But Funding Challenges Threaten The Quality Of Future Monitoring Activities

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training evaluate the Green Jobs program; and in so doing, obtain an estimate of funds each grantee will realistically spend given the current demand for green job-related skills and the job market for green jobs. Any of the remaining \$327.3 million of funds determined not to be needed should be recouped as soon as practicable and to the extent permitted by law so that they can be available for other purposes.

We appreciate the cooperation and courtesies that ETA personnel extended to the Office of Inspector General during this audit. OIG personnel who made major contributions to this report are listed in Appendix E.



Elliot P. Lewis
Assistant Inspector General for Audit

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Exhibits

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Exhibit 1

Grant Awards, Expenditures, and Training Outcomes for All Grants as of June 30, 2011

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
SESP Grants (34 grants in total)									
1	Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs	<i>Award:</i> \$6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> \$1,622,595	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	2,100 656	1,800 656	1,442 324	1,150 32	975 19	900 0
2	Alaska Department of Labor & Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 3,600,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 386,809	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	700 223	700 223	665 201	599 136	539 136	539 41
3	Arizona Department of Economic Security	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 330,778	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,648 1,049	1,648 989	1,502 300	1,118 131	1,083 129	942 14
4	Arkansas Workforce Investment Board/Department of Workforce Services	<i>Award:</i> 4,866,479 <i>Expenditures:</i> 934,815	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	2,800 538	2,240 538	1,792 177	1,523 6	1,344 5	1,371 0
5	Colorado Department of Labor and Employment	<i>Award:</i> 5,998,050 <i>Expenditures:</i> 227,654	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,200 833	1,200 833	830 501	775 421	760 421	713 16
6	Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 5,973,657 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,746,210	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,379 801	1,379 798	1,164 542	772 136	681 128	659 14
7	Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Labor & Industry	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,000,606	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,379 657	1,061 656	1,061 272	1,061 74	Not specified 63	Not specified 19
8	Connecticut Employment and Training Commission	<i>Award:</i> 3,360,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 836,754	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	895 201	895 201	813 176	551 71	486 71	441 0
9	Kentucky Education and Workforce Development Cabinet	<i>Award:</i> 4,740,457 <i>Expenditures:</i> 847,934	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	620 185	620 185	560 66	503 5	469 4	444 0

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
10	Hawaii Department of Labor and Industrial Relations	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 397,033	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,300 550	1,243 524	1,172 409	625 5	Not specified 3	586 0
11	Idaho Department of Labor	<i>Award:</i> 5,991,184 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,280,388	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	Not specified 422	1,418 422	569 103	315* 12	356 11	315 0
12	Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 520,942	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,836 203	1,836 202	1,694 19	1,310 11	1,310 11	1,305 0
13	Indiana Department of Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 268,903	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	2,500 219	2,500 218	2,190 154	2,140 27	2,075 26	1,940 0
14	Iowa Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 5,997,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 400,368	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	Not specified 214	Not specified 214	Not specified 53	Not specified 0	Not specified 0	Not specified 0
15	Kansas Department of Commerce	<i>Award:</i> 5,999,890 <i>Expenditures:</i> 284,511	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,580 206	1,316 205	1,053 79	824* 3	927 1	824 0
16	Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation	<i>Award:</i> 5,793,183 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,156,316	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	2,265 641	2,265 641	1,833 313	1,714 0	1,415 0	1,484 0
17	Michigan Department of Energy, Labor & Economic Growth	<i>Award:</i> 5,819,999 <i>Expenditures:</i> 720,810	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,282 444	1,137 444	Not specified 150	1,052 30	Not specified 29	986 6
18	Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 534,410	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,495 452	1,495 450	1,196 242	897 45	628 44	718 1
19	Missouri Division of Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 943,502	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	810 222	810 222	635 184	525 31	505 30	475 0
20	Nebraska Department of Labor	<i>Award:</i> 4,839,511 <i>Expenditures:</i> 289,941	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	950 281	867 281	737 237	351 26	329 24	315 0

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
21	Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 147,408	<i>Proposed:</i> 7,125 <i>Reported:</i> 375	7,125	7,125	6,289	5,557	732	5,238
					355	346	57	55	4
22	New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 147,263	<i>Proposed:</i> 3,412 <i>Reported:</i> 261	3,412	3,412	3,073	2,311**	Not specified	2,311
					261	0	0	0	0
23	New Mexico Department of Workforce Solutions	<i>Award:</i> 5,999,989 <i>Expenditures:</i> 82,240	<i>Proposed:</i> 3,125 <i>Reported:</i> 36	3,125	2,500	2,000	1,440*	1,800	1,440
					36	0	0	0	0
24	North Carolina Department of Commerce, Division of Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 5,976,512 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,415,887	<i>Proposed:</i> 1,137 <i>Reported:</i> 465	1,137	1,137	998	733**	783	733
					460	182	67	64	0
25	Oregon State of Education Department of Community Colleges and Workforce	<i>Award:</i> 5,383,568 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,672,026	<i>Proposed:</i> 1,247 <i>Reported:</i> 620	1,247	1,247	1,060	898	811	848
					620	132	108	107	5
26	South Dakota Department of Labor	<i>Award:</i> 2,500,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,107,267	<i>Proposed:</i> 400 <i>Reported:</i> 227	400	300	285	270	257	270
					101	29	9	0	0
27	State of California Employment Development Department	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,062,921	<i>Proposed:</i> 1,200 <i>Reported:</i> 259	1,200	1,200	960	960	900	840
					227	42	40	38	0
28	State of Ohio	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 30,338	<i>Proposed:</i> 1,800 <i>Reported:</i> 29	1,800	1,600	1,500	655**	200	655
					29	0	0	0	0
29	State of Oklahoma	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 401,242	<i>Proposed:</i> 1,200 <i>Reported:</i> 542	1,200	1,200	1,100	1,050	1,000	950
					540	217	133	133	0
30	Utah Department of Workforce Services	<i>Award:</i> 4,600,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 767,466	<i>Proposed:</i> 1,400 <i>Reported:</i> 107	1,400	1,400	Not specified	1,108**	955	1,108
					104	0	0	0	0
31	Washington State Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board	<i>Award:</i> 5,973,635 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,144,955	<i>Proposed:</i> 5,446 <i>Reported:</i> 816	5,446	5,174	4,915	4,771	4,731	4,022
					813	683	257	256	37

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
32	Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 131,178	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	4,508 14	4,206 14	2,944 14	2,650 0	2,503 0	2,120 0
33	Workforce West Virginia	<i>Award:</i> 6,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,335,951	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	2,082 501	2,002 487	1,749 452	1,568 117	0 73	1,465 0
34	Wyoming Department of Workforce Services	<i>Award:</i> 4,495,704 <i>Expenditures:</i> 315,487	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	2,023 297	Not specified 269	1,755 271	1,041 77	Not specified 74	1,041 0
Subtotals for SESP grants:		<i>Award:</i> \$187,908,818 <i>Expenditures:</i> \$24,492,908	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	62,844 13,546	58,933 13,218	49,536 6,870	42,817 2,067	28,554 1,955	37,998 157
Pathways Grants (38 grants in total)									
35	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> \$2,308,200 <i>Expenditures:</i> \$911,594	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	200 99	200 99	200 79	180** 28	160 10	180 0
36	Better Family Life, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 3,305,493 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,003,126	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,000 894	900 482	783 297	700 113	700 112	525 25
37	Boley Centers, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 2,300,678 <i>Expenditures:</i> 966,422	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	225 149	150 113	127 45	125 25	80 15	100 6
38	Citrus Levy Marion Regional Workforce Development Board, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 2,985,175 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,198,539	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	665 344	665 341	556 81	556 80	556 37	516 1
39	City of Minneapolis	<i>Award:</i> 4,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 3,003,025	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	500 586	500 580	400 400	300 196	210 146	240 59
40	Central New York Works, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 3,715,931 <i>Expenditures:</i> 491,227	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,000 852	750 56	488 23	366 11	293 11	146 0

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention	
41	Community College of Philadelphia	<i>Award:</i>	3,184,428	<i>Proposed:</i>	250	250	225	203	195	162
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	759,156	<i>Reported:</i>	177	177	100	36	20	4
42	Consortium for Worker Education	<i>Award:</i>	4,000,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	500	448	378	270	188	184
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	995,177	<i>Reported:</i>	273	246	42	26	17	0
43	East Harlem Employment Services, Inc.	<i>Award:</i>	4,728,419	<i>Proposed:</i>	3,639	1,819	1,258	881	818	557
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	1,914,562	<i>Reported:</i>	1,144	1,103	541	143	71	3
44	Eastern Maine Development Corporation	<i>Award:</i>	2,109,088	<i>Proposed:</i>	150	135	110	90	65	75
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	449,231	<i>Reported:</i>	96	51	19	5	4	0
45	Florida State College at Jacksonville	<i>Award:</i>	2,229,642	<i>Proposed:</i>	390	390	332	282	240	240
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	747,805	<i>Reported:</i>	140	139	53	0	0	0
46	Goodwill Industries International	<i>Award:</i>	7,303,634	<i>Proposed:</i>	1,300	997	764	621	571	467
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	2,781,340	<i>Reported:</i>	1,221	930	566	256	181	59
47	Grand Rapids Community College	<i>Award:</i>	4,000,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	1,250	1,080	464	302	151	227
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	1,220,621	<i>Reported:</i>	432	262	116	73	42	15
48	It's My Community Initiative	<i>Award:</i>	4,000,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	236	236	214	190	5	75
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	995,870	<i>Reported:</i>	264	108	62	29	29	0
49	Jobs for the Future, Inc.	<i>Award:</i>	7,997,936	<i>Proposed:</i>	1,130	1,100	997	910	848	732
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	802,526	<i>Reported:</i>	982	930	309	153	134	14
50	Lehigh Valley Workforce Investment Board, Inc.	<i>Award:</i>	4,000,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	400	225	100	75	70	65
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	967,694	<i>Reported:</i>	498	145	21	14	14	0
51	Los Angeles Community College District	<i>Award:</i>	4,000,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	925	925	878	667	600	527
		<i>Expenditures:</i>	420,493	<i>Reported:</i>	295	134	22	20	20	0

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
52	MDC, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 3,780,816 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,477,329	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	734 344	711 340	580 134	391 23	318 17	322 0
53	Mi Casa Resource Center for Women, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 3,633,195 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,594,580	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	500 656	500 457	400 425	270 139	50 125	224 20
54	Mott Community College	<i>Award:</i> 3,662,403 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,306,523	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	300 131	200 131	170 66	160 31	140 25	130 0
55	Moultrie Technical College	<i>Award:</i> 3,753,579 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,459,354	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	360 108	324 85	260 0	208* 0	208 0	208 0
56	National Association of Regional Councils	<i>Award:</i> 7,994,999 <i>Expenditures:</i> 3,425,356	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,000 782	800 541	600 208	500 147	500 111	500 7
57	National Council of La Raza	<i>Award:</i> 3,063,839 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,413,359	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	241 190	241 177	216 7	161 0	139 0	130 0
58	Northern Rural Training & Employment Consortium	<i>Award:</i> 4,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,113,176	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	615 379	554 368	443 154	431 123	420 110	345 37
59	Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 4,900,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,949,867	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,600 621	1,350 511	Not specified 384	1,066 123	1,066 81	853 12
60	Pathstone Corporation	<i>Award:</i> 8,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,337,885	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,200 602	1,176 455	660 25	616** 22	360 4	616 0
61	Private Industry Council of Westmoreland/Fayette, Incorporated	<i>Award:</i> 2,732,719 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,895,066	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	250 433	245 372	191 141	153 112	120 88	115 26
62	Providence Economic Development Partnership	<i>Award:</i> 2,489,111 <i>Expenditures:</i> 836,787	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	300 146	240 146	225 76	180 33	Not specified 17	160 4

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
63	Roca, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 2,398,778 <i>Expenditures:</i> 821,824	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	225 191	225 135	150 59	140 54	110 48	98 0
64	SER - Jobs for Progress of the Texas Gulf Coast, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 3,122,554 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,189,454	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	400 258	400 258	360 238	340 71	320 52	300 8
65	Southeast Community College Area	<i>Award:</i> 2,331,278 <i>Expenditures:</i> 870,427	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	400 217	400 205	220 67	190 33	110 13	90 0
66	Southwest Housing Solutions Corporation	<i>Award:</i> 4,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,321,503	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	1,200 282	425 282	410 167	360 78	320 65	310 0
67	The WorkPlace, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 4,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,419,599	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	700 477	600 364	500 287	350 70	320 43	275 11
68	West Hills Community College District	<i>Award:</i> 3,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,937,495	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	300 337	300 319	210 280	147 185	126 170	115 32
69	Western Iowa Tech Community College	<i>Award:</i> 3,999,459 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,305,597	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	300 300	300 267	222 74	165 21	142 18	142 0
70	White Earth Band of Chippewa	<i>Award:</i> 3,086,817 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,178,869	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	240 104	240 95	100 26	30** 2	25 0	30 0
71	Workforce Development Council of Seattle King County	<i>Award:</i> 3,639,530 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,662,218	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	475 274	450 273	406 152	365 78	275 55	335 17
72	Worksystems, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 4,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,315,831	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	360 361	300 277	225 56	180 0	160 0	126 0
Subtotals for Pathways grants:		<i>Award:</i> \$147,757,701 <i>Expenditures:</i> \$57,460,507	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	25,460 15,639	20,751 11,954	14,822 5,802	13,121 2,553	10,979 1,905	10,442 360

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
ETP Grants (25 grants in total)									
73	Austin Electrical Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee								
	<i>Award:</i>	\$4,842,424	<i>Proposed:</i>	1,100	1,100	950	504**	504	504
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	\$1,860,253	<i>Reported:</i>	1,393	1,393	442	73	18	29
74	Blue Green Alliance								
	<i>Award:</i>	5,000,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	2,063	2,063	1,650	1,238	1,000	1,000
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	2,994,160	<i>Reported:</i>	1,133	1,130	983	228	205	16
75	Broward County Minority Builders Coalition								
	<i>Award:</i>	3,280,656	<i>Proposed:</i>	1,000	900	700	700	600	600
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	1,336,271	<i>Reported:</i>	351	351	304	119	65	6
76	California Joint Labor Management Cooperation Committee								
	<i>Award:</i>	5,000,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	2,192	2,192	2,082	1,592**	1,592	1,592
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	2,393,480	<i>Reported:</i>	1,009	1,009	827	375	375	221
77	Central Vermont Community Action Council, Inc.								
	<i>Award:</i>	4,846,195	<i>Proposed:</i>	2,542	2,542	2,397	1,127**	1,127	1,127
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	1,622,509	<i>Reported:</i>	1,366	1,270	1,218	948	921	281
78	Community Housing Partners Corporation								
	<i>Award:</i>	3,865,480	<i>Proposed:</i>	380	350	320	250	200	200
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	2,000,288	<i>Reported:</i>	479	432	245	160	134	3
79	Communications Workers of America National Education and Training Trust								
	<i>Award:</i>	3,969,056	<i>Proposed:</i>	1,000	1,000	1,000	420	Not specified	Not specified
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	1,612,940	<i>Reported:</i>	830	367	59	0	0	0
80	East Central Intergovernmental Association - Business Growth, Inc.								
	<i>Award:</i>	2,060,250	<i>Proposed:</i>	392	392	344	310	283	283
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	552,166	<i>Reported:</i>	265	265	245	95	51	38
81	Healthcare Advancement Program, Inc.								
	<i>Award:</i>	4,637,551	<i>Proposed:</i>	3,520	3,472	3,420	2,852**	2,852	2,852
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	1,665,888	<i>Reported:</i>	1,363	371	0	0	0	0
82	Heritage Health Foundation								
	<i>Award:</i>	1,408,601	<i>Proposed:</i>	120	120	102	90	84	84
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	632,885	<i>Reported:</i>	427	148	112	52	26	7
83	Institute for Career Development, Inc.								
	<i>Award:</i>	4,658,983	<i>Proposed:</i>	2,000	1,900	1,200	240**	240	240
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	2,167,114	<i>Reported:</i>	540	538	271	47	18	0

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
84	International Training Institute for the Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Industry	<i>Award:</i> 4,995,188 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,332,179	<i>Proposed:</i> 1,500 <i>Reported:</i> 304	1,500	1,500	1,482	930*	930	930
					304	287	7	7	0
85	International Transportation Learning Center	<i>Award:</i> 5,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,718,787	<i>Proposed:</i> 3,640 <i>Reported:</i> 1,464	3,640	3,640	3,276	3,095	3,095	2,912
					1,464	1,429	0	0	0
86	Labor's Community Action, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 3,604,162 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,440,151	<i>Proposed:</i> 1,913 <i>Reported:</i> 1,970	1,913	1,817	1,530	1,071	856	856
					1,947	560	21	14	11
87	Memphis Bioworks Foundation	<i>Award:</i> 2,931,103 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,795,166	<i>Proposed:</i> 450 <i>Reported:</i> 465	450	395	314	247	192	182
					412	134	26	23	3
88	Montana Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Council	<i>Award:</i> 5,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,743,470	<i>Proposed:</i> 2,475 <i>Reported:</i> 2,138	2,475	2,475	2,450	2,230	2,007	2,007
					2,138	2,129	0	0	0
89	National Ironworkers and Employers Apprenticeship Training and Journeyman Upgrading Fund	<i>Award:</i> 1,943,931 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,101,589	<i>Proposed:</i> 510 <i>Reported:</i> 441	510	510	510	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified
					441	437	280	22	41
90	Northwest Energy Efficiency Council	<i>Award:</i> 3,876,171 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,036,850	<i>Proposed:</i> 875 <i>Reported:</i> 620	875	750	675	473	405	405
					605	354	70	63	1
91	Ohio Electrical Labor Management Cooperative Committee	<i>Award:</i> 4,826,073 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,930,948	<i>Proposed:</i> 1,400 <i>Reported:</i> 1,972	1,400	1,400	1,288	1,125**	1,125	1,125
					1,972	663	433	401	46
92	Oregon Manufacturing Extension Partnership	<i>Award:</i> 5,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 993,507	<i>Proposed:</i> 1,734 <i>Reported:</i> 1,257	1,734	1,734	1,672	638	542	542
					1,249	207	23	23	0
93	SER Metro Detroit, Jobs for Progress, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 4,298,673 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,332,847	<i>Proposed:</i> 264 <i>Reported:</i> 191	264	240	216	192	144	144
					191	127	64	52	16
94	The Providence Plan	<i>Award:</i> 3,720,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,197,000	<i>Proposed:</i> 2,075 <i>Reported:</i> 1,045	2,075	1,775	1,600	1,600	800	800
					1,024	841	190	189	18

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
95	Thomas Shortman Training Scholarship and Safety Fund	<i>Award:</i> 2,802,269 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,394,891	<i>Proposed:</i> 2,000 <i>Reported:</i> 1,624	2,000 1,624	2,000 1,624	1,900 1,256	1,900** 8	1,900 8	1,900 0
96	United Auto Workers-Labor Employment and Training Corporation	<i>Award:</i> 3,200,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,407,914	<i>Proposed:</i> 725 <i>Reported:</i> 313	725 313	725 267	550 81	440 18	400 10	400 0
97	Utility Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO	<i>Award:</i> 4,993,922 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,876,820	<i>Proposed:</i> 719 <i>Reported:</i> 617	719 617	719 543	672 259	652 178	592 177	592 82
Subtotals for ETP grants:		<i>Award:</i> \$99,760,688 <i>Expenditures:</i> \$44,140,073	<i>Proposed:</i> 36,589 <i>Reported:</i> 23,577	36,589 23,577	35,711 21,455	32,300 13,470	23,916 3,415	21,470 2,802	21,277 819
State Labor Market Information (30 grants in total)									
98	Hawaii Department of Labor and Industrial Relations	<i>Award:</i> \$1,247,343 <i>Expenditures:</i> \$1,051,500	<i>Proposed:</i> - <i>Reported:</i> -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
99	Iowa Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 1,172,614 <i>Expenditures:</i> 935,816	<i>Proposed:</i> - <i>Reported:</i> -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
100	State of Idaho	<i>Award:</i> 1,250,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 556,336	<i>Proposed:</i> - <i>Reported:</i> -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
101	Kentucky Education and Workforce Development Cabinet	<i>Award:</i> 1,250,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,206,169	<i>Proposed:</i> - <i>Reported:</i> -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
102	Missouri Department of Economic Development	<i>Award:</i> 1,227,192 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,015,724	<i>Proposed:</i> - <i>Reported:</i> -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
103	Employment Security Commission of North Carolina	<i>Award:</i> 946,034 <i>Expenditures:</i> 592,449	<i>Proposed:</i> - <i>Reported:</i> -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
104	New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 1,249,995 <i>Expenditures:</i> 111,316	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
105	New Mexico Department of Workforce Solutions	<i>Award:</i> 1,250,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 712,267	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
106	Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development	<i>Award:</i> 1,155,488 <i>Expenditures:</i> 531,501	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
107	New York State Department of Labor	<i>Award:</i> 1,112,207 <i>Expenditures:</i> 612,120	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
108	Ohio Department of Job And Family Services	<i>Award:</i> 1,015,700 <i>Expenditures:</i> 298,884	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
109	State of Oregon Employment Department	<i>Award:</i> 1,250,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 572,542	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
110	Puerto Rico Department of Labor and Human Resources	<i>Award:</i> 1,248,388 <i>Expenditures:</i> 86,521	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
111	South Carolina Department of Commerce	<i>Award:</i> 763,175 <i>Expenditures:</i> 439,155	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
112	Tennessee Department Of Labor & Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 765,340 <i>Expenditures:</i> 620,221	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
113	Washington State Employment Security Department	<i>Award:</i> 1,060,910 <i>Expenditures:</i> 916,428	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
114	Alaska Department of Labor & Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 800,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 413,555	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
115	Alabama Department of Industrial Relations	<i>Award:</i> 1,145,210 <i>Expenditures:</i> 231,202	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
116	Arizona Department of Economic Security	<i>Award:</i> 1,211,045 <i>Expenditures:</i> 889,407	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
117	State of California/Employment Development Department	<i>Award:</i> 1,250,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 886,958	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
118	Delaware Department of Labor	<i>Award:</i> 889,404 <i>Expenditures:</i> 592,932	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
119	Florida Agency for Workforce Innovation	<i>Award:</i> 1,250,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,250,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
120	Georgia Department of Labor	<i>Award:</i> 1,177,975 <i>Expenditures:</i> 934,031	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
121	Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Labor & Industry	<i>Award:</i> 1,250,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,144,211	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
122	Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing & Regulation	<i>Award:</i> 4,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 3,998,191	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
123	Indiana Department of Workforce Development	<i>Award:</i> 4,000,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,879,390	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
124	Vermont Department of Labor	<i>Award:</i> 3,999,923 <i>Expenditures:</i> 2,266,316	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
125	Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation	<i>Award:</i> 3,753,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 3,654,426	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
126	Montana Department of Labor & Industry	<i>Award:</i> 3,877,949 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,952,290	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
127	State of Louisiana Office of Occupational Information Services, Research & Statistics Division	<i>Award:</i> 2,279,393 <i>Expenditures:</i> 1,070,527	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal State LMI grants:		<i>Award:</i> \$48,848,285 <i>Expenditures:</i> \$31,422,382	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
Green Capacity Building (62 grants in total)									
128	Arch Training Center, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> \$94,255 <i>Expenditures:</i> \$94,255	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
129	Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County	<i>Award:</i> 85,910 <i>Expenditures:</i> 82,462	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
130	San Gabriel Valley Conservation and Service Corps	<i>Award:</i> 98,122 <i>Expenditures:</i> 98,122	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
131	San Diego Imperial Counties Labor Council	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
132	Goodwill Industries, Inc., Serving Eastern Nebraska and Southwest Iowa	<i>Award:</i> 71,714 <i>Expenditures:</i> 69,367	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
133	People Incorporated of Virginia	<i>Award:</i> 42,793 <i>Expenditures:</i> 42,675	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
134	Urban League of Broward County	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 88,820	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
135	Western New York Americorps Fund	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 42,511	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
136	Aletheia House	<i>Award:</i> 70,736 <i>Expenditures:</i> 63,912	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
137	Youthbuild Lake County	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
138	Able-Disabled Advocacy, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
139	Salt Lake Community College	<i>Award:</i> 96,211 <i>Expenditures:</i> 80,435	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
140	Sacramento Local Conservation Corps	<i>Award:</i> 92,820 <i>Expenditures:</i> 80,956	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
141	Florida Institute For Workforce Innovation, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
142	Opportunity Advancement Innovation, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
143	Coalition for Responsible Community Development	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 95,670	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
144	Springfield Urban League, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
145	Easter Seals, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 99,956 <i>Expenditures:</i> 74,720	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
146	San Antonio Youth Centers	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
147	Youthbuild Boston, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
148	Mojave Basin Youth Corps, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 83,455 <i>Expenditures:</i> 12,197	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
149	Pathways-Virginia, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 99,080	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
150	Cobb Housing, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
151	California Indian Manpower Consortium, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 39,574	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
152	City of Peoria Workforce Development Department	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 96,505	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
153	Youth Conservation Corps	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
154	Southern Appalachian Labor School	<i>Award:</i> 98,700 <i>Expenditures:</i> 98,700	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
155	American Youthworks	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
156	Youthbuild Mclean County	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
157	Portland Youthbuilders	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
158	Year One, Inc. dba Mile High Youth Corps	<i>Award:</i> 99,855 <i>Expenditures:</i> 96,038	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
159	Episcopal Community Services of Maryland	<i>Award:</i> 97,128 <i>Expenditures:</i> 97,128	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
160	Walker Montgomery Community Development Corporation	<i>Award:</i> 75,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 74,219	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
161	County of Kern	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
162	Women In Non Traditional Employment Roles	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
163	Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Employment For Women	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
164	Goodwill Industries of the Conemaugh Valley, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 99,524 <i>Expenditures:</i> 99,524	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
165	Arizona Women's Education and Employment, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
166	Latin American Youth Center Youthbuild Public Charter School	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 85,696	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
167	Co-Opportunity, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 69,933 <i>Expenditures:</i> 0	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
168	The Workplace, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 59,894 <i>Expenditures:</i> 20,802	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
169	Maui Economic Opportunity, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 87,905	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
170	Comprehensive Community Solutions, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 97,868 <i>Expenditures:</i> 96,050	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
171	Cook Inlet Tribal Council, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 67,268 <i>Expenditures:</i> 58,598	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
172	City of Phoenix	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
173	Los Angeles Communities Advocating for Unity Social Justice	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
174	San Joaquin County Office Of Education	<i>Award:</i> 70,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 70,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
175	Indianapolis Private Industry Council, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 65,563	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
176	Young Adult Development In Action, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 100,000	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
177	Goodwill Industries International	<i>Award:</i> 100,000 <i>Expenditures:</i> 99,836	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
178	Community Teamwork, Inc.	<i>Award:</i> 77,585 <i>Expenditures:</i> 77,585	<i>Proposed:</i> <i>Reported:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
179	Old Colony Y								
	<i>Award:</i>	100,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	100,000	<i>Reported:</i>						
180	Youthbuild USA, Inc.								
	<i>Award:</i>	78,047	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	35,979	<i>Reported:</i>						
181	Blackfeet Tribal Business Council								
	<i>Award:</i>	96,257	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	96,257	<i>Reported:</i>						
182	Workforceconnections								
	<i>Award:</i>	99,965	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	99,965	<i>Reported:</i>						
183	Northeast Parent & Child Society, Inc.								
	<i>Award:</i>	100,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	35,506	<i>Reported:</i>						
184	Telamon Corporation								
	<i>Award:</i>	100,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	97,631	<i>Reported:</i>						
185	Improved Solutions For Urban Systems, Inc.								
	<i>Award:</i>	100,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	100,000	<i>Reported:</i>						
186	Connection Training Services								
	<i>Award:</i>	100,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	95,587	<i>Reported:</i>						
187	Experience Works, Inc.								
	<i>Award:</i>	100,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	97,602	<i>Reported:</i>						
188	National Institute for Metalworking Skills, Inc.								
	<i>Award:</i>	93,000	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	93,000	<i>Reported:</i>						
189	Milwaukee Area Workforce Investment Board								
	<i>Award:</i>	98,364	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	98,364	<i>Reported:</i>						

No.	Grantee Name	Awards & Expenditures	Proposed/ Reported	Served	Enrolled in Training	Completed Training	Entered Employment	Entered in Training-Related Employment	Employment Retention
Subtotals for Green Capacity grants:									
	<i>Award:</i>	\$5,814,360	<i>Proposed:</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Expenditures:</i>	\$5,238,796	<i>Reported:</i>						

Summary of Award and Expenditures for all Grants in Audit Universe

	Award	Expenditures
Training (97 Grants in Total)		
State Energy Sector Partnership Subtotals (34 Grants in Total)	\$187,908,818	\$24,492,908
Pathways out of Poverty Subtotals (38 Grants in Total)	147,757,701	57,460,507
Energy Training Partnership Subtotals (25 Grants in Total)	99,760,888	44,140,073
Training Grant Subtotal:	\$435,427,207	\$126,093,488
Non-Training (92 Grants in Total)		
State Labor Market Information Subtotals (30 Grants in Total)	\$48,848,285	\$31,422,385
Green Capacity Subtotals (62 Grants in Total)	5,814,360	5,238,796
Non-Training Grant Subtotal:	\$54,662,645	\$36,661,181
Training Grant & Non-Training Grant Totals (189 Grants in Total)	\$490,089,852	\$162,754,669

* The number for “Entered Employment” was not provided by ETA. Therefore, the number proposed as “Employment Retention” was used for consistency.

** The number for “Entered Employment” provided by ETA was less than the proposed “Employment Retention”. As a result, the number proposed as “Employment Retention” was used.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Exhibit 2

Proposed Deliverables and Reported Status for Sampled State LMI Grants as of June 30, 2011

No.	Grantee Name	Award Amount	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
1	Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing & Regulation	\$4,000,000	\$3,998,191	Industry reports and white papers detailing the methodology and findings of related labor market research and results of the green jobs survey (survey instrument & methodology report, green market profile, green labor market profile, green jobs and training profile, green economy impact report, green workforce investment), MARC Green Consortium Portal (includes career information, competency models and job seeker guidance).	All deliverables completed. Deliverables include a comprehensive three-state regional green employment, education, and training survey of 10,000 employer, state-specific research on the green workforce and training providers, online integration of the DC, MD and VA's labor exchange capabilities, and a state-of-the art regional green jobs portal.
2	Indiana Department of Workforce Development	\$4,000,000	\$1,879,390	Auto industry transformation study (in-depth interviews, supply chain transformation research (questionnaire, focus groups, interviews, analysis of research), alternative career pathways (employer survey, skill transferability analysis using TORQ, job posting analysis using Help Wanted Online tool), and skill gap analysis (analysis using skills-based projections software). Overall project deliverables: projected employment estimates (green auto industry), identification of new occupational requirements including associated skills and occupations, estimates of auto suppliers that will survive the auto industry transformation and estimates of those that will diversify, summary of training requirements for occupations in the green auto industry, skill gap analysis and skills projections for green occupations, summary of career pathways for dislocated auto industry workers, description of required training programs and curriculum, identification and analysis of currently available green job openings, summary of green job wages.	Developed a specialized career guidance tool that suggests alternative career pathways for dislocated workers. Developed a tri-state training data base listing green and growing occupations for training programs. Completed detailed analytical reports on auto industry transformation.

No.	Grantee Name	Award Amount	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
3	Vermont Department of Labor	\$3,999,923	\$2,266,316	Literature review and synthesis, convene regional conference, convene local industry expert panels, compile data into a preliminary listing of green jobs and industries (to be included in the Green Jobs Portal), creation of electronic tools to code green job vacancies, develop demand analysis and projections (current demand, short term vacancy projections, list of skills and work activities and education requirements, analysis of green job vacancies among green and non-green industries), tag green employers in InfoUSA database, electronic and other dissemination tools (including Green Job Banks)--Green Jobs Portal, Web services tools, labor exchange support.	The initial grant identified eight deliverables. Grantee pursued activities for seven of them. Continued testing of the "Green" definitions for refinements for phrases with green. Green company lists were expanded and augmented by companies posting green jobs. New reporting database structure was refined for the real time data. Work on the consumer guide to real time data. Work on the vacancy projections model.
4	Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation	\$3,753,000	\$3,654,426	New Projections Suite software platform, Skills-Based Projections tool, Occupational Descriptor module, comprehensive Projections Training Program (capacity-building), plan for leveraging current LMI infrastructure to sustain Projections Training, plan for Projections track as national training (LMI Institute).	Completed final beta testing and approved Short Term Industry Projections (STIP) software. Completed development of training narrative - stage 3 edits for 11 STIP methods files. In process for inputs for STIP and report manager course. Completed a SME review of the Projections Suite Help documentation. Began planning process for development and launch of the online learning management system.
5	State of Louisiana Office of Occupational Information Services, Research & Statistics Division	\$2,279,393	\$1,070,527	Green job statutes and regulations for each state (summary report), educational resources report, green jobs survey, current and projected green jobs vacancies and estimates, development of career ladders/lattices/pathways, web-based tool that houses information on skill requirements/training resources/wage potential/career pathways.	Final drafts of 22 industry profiles were completed and are undergoing final review. Work on the 22 industry profiles are nearing completion and awaiting green employment projections. The industry and occupational green employment projections have been completed. This will be merged with other projections. Final training provider lists have been completed for each state. Three draft industry competency models for NAICS sectors have been completed. Green Jobs Extractor software is still in progress. Website development still in progress.

No.	Grantee Name	Award Amount	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
6	State of Idaho	\$1,250,000	\$556,336	Green jobs survey, green job vacancy survey, energy and green job employment projections, human capital supply side data analysis, training/certification/licensure/skills catalogue, web-based analytical tools, Idaho business directory update, Idaho Comprehensive Green Jobs Research Report, Idaho Career Information System and into CAREERS enhancements, online green job fairs, public services announcement campaign, print/online/social networking campaign, Idaho Energy and Green Jobs Pay Posters, Idaho Green Jobs Workshop Series.	Published green jobs report and issued press release. Published green job interviews: worked on developing green micro site and tested initial ideas with local job seekers. Published green statutes.
7	Kentucky Education and Workforce Development Cabinet	\$1,250,000	\$1,206,169	Survey results (current estimated employment by industry and occupation, short- and long-term industry and occupational projections, OES wage data, report on survey and research findings, details regarding educational and training resources (certifications and licensing information) available related to green occupations, reports (green career profiles, green occupational outlook, green manufacturing industries profiles, green industries in Kentucky), outreach (press releases, podcasts, social networking/blog communication, pamphlets, presentations, consultations with local elected officials), labor supply database, analytical tool to guide training and reemployment resources toward demand occupations.	Green jobs survey information was released to the public and DOL ETA in August 2011.
8	New Mexico Department of Workforce Solutions	\$1,250,000	\$712,267	Green Jobs employer survey (number and type of green jobs by industry, number of green businesses), follow-up surveys (green job growth, impact of ARRA funds), short- and long-term employment projections, publication (reports), outreach presentations, online interactive career planning programs, "Green Recovery Workstation", Green Job Portal.	Contractor completed its development, installation, testing and integration of the Green Jobs landing page which lists Green occupational opportunities and have mapping capabilities of available jobs in NM.

No.	Grantee Name	Award Amount	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
9	State of Oregon Employment Department	\$1,250,000	\$572,542	Labor market information research (current employment estimates for green jobs, wages and benefits, short- and long-term industry and occupational projections, identification of energy efficiency and renewable energy businesses and green occupations), publications (10 stand-alone reports, 12 special green jobs-related articles, brochures), presentations.	Eight deliverables were completed during the quarter. Ten deliverables are expected to be completed during the quarter ended September 30, 2011. Published employment analysis, two green related articles, two website articles, and two blog posting. Completed data collections process for statewide survey of green jobs, completed nine WorkKeys profiles and 10 WorkKeys occupational reports. Completed one Green Career Pathway, completed coding of community college green courses and training programs. Published a Green Training Performance System report, completed the integration of AutoCoder into WOMIS.
10	State of California/ Employment Development Department	\$1,250,000	\$886,958	California Green Economy Survey Report (employment estimates by industry, occupation and geographic area; list of energy efficiency and renewable energy businesses), Green Occupational Skills Research Report (skill/competency requirements), Improving Skills Transference Report (skills assessment tool research & recommendation, online green training inventory, feasibility study).	Success of meeting the grant deliverable is contingent upon testing the prototype in a Web environment to ensure that green programs are tagged and readily identifiable as “green”. Testing of prototype training inventory system is underway. Collecting green training provider information and tracking green training programs continue. Updating training inventory data tables are underway. Developing green taxonomy to codify green certificate or degree programs that do not have an existing 2010 CIP code.
11	Florida Agency for Workforce Innovation	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000	Labor market research, green jobs survey results (employment, skills, credentials, certifications, and apprenticeships), employment projections, green jobs survey reports (industry, occupation, and region), and skills/certification list.	The green jobs survey, a key deliverable, was completed. Two other deliverables – Green Jobs Portal, and greening of the Construction Workforce Development Center Labor supply/Demand Forecasting model were also completed.
12	Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Labor & Industry	\$1,250,000	\$1,144,211	The project develops an automated career tool to market green jobs to job seekers that will include information on wages, career paths, and education and certification requirements.	Six deliverables - inventory of green training capacity, economy-wide green employment survey, listening sessions across Pennsylvania, training needs assessment, job task analysis green career tool, and green skills survey. Four of the six deliverables are complete.

No.	Grantee Name	Award Amount	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
13	Puerto Rico Department of Labor and Human Resources	\$1,248,388	\$86,521	Puerto Rico will identify green activity characteristics and develop a system to make information available on green industry composition and projections; industry clusters and economic data; academic skills requirements; academic, technical, and vocational courses, degrees, licenses, and certifications; and job openings.	The survey phase was completed. The Dissemination phase and the information system development and Web page design contract were awarded and are in process.
14	Hawaii Department of Labor and Industrial Relations	\$1,247,343	\$1,051,500	Green Workforce Study (5 reports for industry, 5 reports for state and local areas, sectors study for construction, high-tech and tourism), Preliminary Projection Estimates, Training Gap Assessment, LMI Dissemination and User Interface Assessment, Web-based Workforce Development Information Portals, Labor Exchange and Rapid Reemployment Enhancement, Sectoral and Local Area Strategies, Capacity Building, Outreach and Awareness (press releases, town hall meetings, conference presentation, green career and job fair participation, etc.).	Published four additional volumes to baseline <i>Hawaii's Green Workforce</i> report. The five volume series contains content specific to green labor market information. Developed marketing and public relations strategies based on a program brochure and branded materials. Helped co-sponsored a <u>Green Workforce Development Conference & Expo</u> Hosted an innovative "Green Zone" at the state's largest career and job fair. Co-sponsored a 30-minute TV show. Produced a 10 minute video showcasing green workforce development. Participated in other events.
15	Arizona Department of Economic Security	\$1,211,045	\$889,407	Results from this project will include access to training leading to industry recognized credentials, certifications, or degrees specific to green industries.	Battelle Technology Partnership report was completed. It focuses on definition of state's definition of green economy, global trends, State green output and jobs. State's position on innovation for green economy, and strategic opportunities. A second deliverable was completed – Arizona Green Jobs survey Report. Research and analysis of green jobs vacancies in Arizona using Burning Glass Technologies Real-Time LMI data was completed. The final deliverable – technical memo outlining the differences between the methodologies and results reported in the Green Jobs Survey report and the real –Time LMI job vacancy reports.

No.	Grantee Name	Award Amount	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
16	Georgia Department of Labor	\$1,177,975	\$ 934,031	Green Jobs Survey Data (estimates of businesses/workers engaged in renewable energy generation, clean transportation, natural resource conservation, pollution prevention and environmental clean up activities; estimates of workers that produce green-related products and services; estimates of number of people in green occupations; benefits offered to green workers, green worker demographics; etc), green programs added to ETP list, green jobs brochure, information added to Georgia Career Information System, green data added to Georgia Labor Market Explorer, new green jobs portal.	June 2011 Performance Report not available
17	Iowa Workforce Development	\$1,172,614	\$935,816	The labor supply portion of the project will use IWD's data collection tools to develop a Human Capital Inventory of workers that will include: worker locations, income levels, education, skills, experience and willingness to relocate or change to a Green Economy job.	Completed all deliverables. These include Inventory of Iowa registered apprenticeships in the Green Economy, Iowa Green Economy laborshed Studies Report, Green Economy Regulation and Incentive White Report. Sunopsis of Energy Sector Workforce Demographics /gender study, Green Economy Business Demand Occupational Survey Report, Green Economy Supply and demand analysis, Iowa Green Economy Human Capital Inventory, Auto Industry supply chain study, State Building Deconstruction and recycling inventory, Links Web Portal to Iowa Works, Modify I-works Labor Exchange system.
18	Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development	\$1,155,488	\$531,501	Comprehensive estimates of green job vacancies in Minnesota, SOC code, across all industries. Estimates of green employment by occupation, industry, and region. List of green occupations experiencing labor force shortages. Comprehensive list of skill and education requirements for each green SOC-O*NET occupation. Description of typical skill gaps in green occupations. Estimates of median wage offers in green jobs, by SOC occupation. A green identifier for postings in the state job bank.	Wrote articles for Minnesota Economic Review and Minnesota Economic Trends on Green jobs. Linked brochures, presentations and articles from Iseek Green Careers as well as the DEED Green Jobs Website.

No.	Grantee Name	Award Amount	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
19	Alabama Department of Industrial Relations	\$1,145,210	\$231,202	2 surveys (1-labor supply information, 2-benefits provided by employers); analysis of surveys (report); current employment estimates in Green Industries & occupations for state and regions; short- and long-term green industry & occupational projections; list of green businesses in AL; skills assessment; occupation assessment (including skill gaps); job vacancy estimates; online labor exchange & data reporting application (software).	June 2011 Performance Report not available.
20	Washington State Employment Security Department	\$1,060,910	\$916,428	Project deliverables will include an enhanced green occupational profile and comparison reports, integrated data services to exchange information with other state systems, enhanced and integrated workforce and economic monitoring and analytical tools, and an online training resource to promote the understanding of workforce and economic concepts and the green economy.	Deliverables include data feeds/web services, green flag integration, occupational search tool, usability study, online learning center, and analysis. Requirements phase of all deliverables are complete. Development phase is complete for four of the six deliverables. Testing phase complete for five of six deliverables. In process for the sixth deliverable.
21	Ohio Department of Job and Family Services	\$1,015,700	\$298,884	The grantee will use project findings to develop a green jobs curriculum, produce an Ohio green jobs training directory, disseminate green career pathways modules and information through One Stops and WIA eligible training providers, and develop new green jobs interfaces for the state labor exchange system.	The grant partners completed a four-part report based on research from the project. The Voinovich School completed and delivered the green pathways data base of green jobs educations programs. The database has been integrated in the Ohio Bureau of Labor Market Information's Career Exploration tool. Conducted five regional Career Pathways forums.
22	Employment Security Commission of North Carolina	\$946,034	\$592,449	Green job titles, employment, average wage, current vacancies, short- and long-term projections, educational requirements and skills/certifications needed; HWOL research; green jobs report detailing green industries and occupations; online web tool designed to estimate supply of human capital; summary of public educational resources the provide green courses and programs that lead to industry-recognized credentials, certificates or degrees.	The project team completed data collection. The research specialist and assistant began cleaning the data set.

No.	Grantee Name	Award Amount	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
23	Alaska Department of Labor & Workforce Development	\$800,000	\$413,555	Alaska will conduct labor market research and deliver a wide variety of LMI products to better target education and training investments, leading to more informed public policies, and providing the ability to measure the impact of green economic investments.	Four of six deliverables are completed. The remaining two are in progress. Alaska's Green Jobs Report and green jobs webpage went live. Green occupational information incorporated into Alaska's career information delivery system was completed. Skills –based profiles of Alaska green jobs are in development. Green occupational information incorporated into Alaska's career ladder product. A report on Alaska's green jobs and industry produced from the results of green job survey of employers to be published in <i>Alaska Economic Trends</i> . Alaska Career Information System has been completed.
24	Tennessee Department of Labor & Workforce Development	\$765,340	\$620,221	Green jobs survey (report, consultations with partners and interested parties), enhanced online self-service labor exchange module (added to The Source), an independent analysis of six large investments in renewable energy/energy efficiency/related green job sectors.	Completed a comprehensive Tennessee green jobs survey of 6,000 firms. Completed a supplemental survey with a portion of the 6,000 firms to obtain more information on green jobs qualifications and requirements. Completed an impact studies on six groundbreaking green industry investments in Tennessee. Enhanced Labor Exchange is being purchased and installed and completion is expected September 2011. Expect September 2011 publication on website for using transferable skills analysis with auto-related workers to determine their potential to transfer to green jobs.

Exhibit 3

Proposed Deliverables and Reported Status for Sampled Green Capacity Grants as of June 30, 2011¹

No.	Grantee Name	Grant Award	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
1	Urban League of Broward County	\$100,000	\$88,820	Modify existing YouthBuild curriculum and field training to include five new modules in energy-efficient building, construction, and retrofitting. Develop a green construction career training pathway that enables YouthBuild program graduates to enter into formal Registered Apprenticeships in the Housing Authority's STEP UP program.	Water Efficiency, Energy & Atmosphere, Material & Resource and Indoor Environmental Quality Modules all completed. Final Walk-Through and Certification / Graduation completed
2	Western New York AmeriCorps Fund	\$100,000	\$42,511	Produce updated curriculum and outreach materials reflecting the YouthBuild Goes Green initiative. Modify curriculum to include home assessment and weatherization training for all YouthBuild participants.	The program used funds during the past quarter to purchase 1 insulation blower for \$13,891.47 and 1 truck for \$29,854. The purchases will be used to support the service projects and on site training of the Department of Labor YouthBuild members.
3	Coalition for Responsible Community Development	\$100,000	\$95,670	Update YouthBuild career exploration curriculum to include information about green construction, energy efficiency, and weatherization jobs. Update YouthBuild core construction curriculum to include training in green building techniques such as green construction, energy efficiency, and weatherization. Develop Green Jobs Career Pathway, which will serve as a career ladder pipeline to help YouthBuild graduates make a smooth academic transition to green education and training certificate and degree programs at Los Angeles Trade Technical College.	Completed the deliverables as of May 31, 2011. These included building the South LA YouthBuild Green Jobs program. Specifically, expanded the Career Exploration Curriculum, Provide Professional Development, Augment the Core Construction Curriculum with "Green" Training, and Develop a Green Jobs Pathway.

¹ All sampled Green Capacity grants have ended as of June 30, 2011.

No.	Grantee Name	Grant Award	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
4	YouthBuild Boston, Inc.	\$100,000	\$100,000	Revise all curriculums to reflect the latest green industry knowledge.	Certifications awarded to students and staff include: 1) OSHA 10, 2) Energy Efficiency Technician (2 week training at the Laborer’s Union training site) 3) Renovation Repair and Painting Certificate and 4) Green Facilities Maintenance, and 5) Sustainable Landscaping Certificate. Staff team updated the PACT curriculum to be green industry relevant. YouthBuild graduates will complete 2 week retrofitting technician program at no cost with International Laborers Union.
5	City of Peoria Workforce Development Department	\$100,000	\$96,505	Enhance the existing YouthBuild program curriculum and hands-on training through incorporation of the NCCER module, “Your Role in the Green Environment” and the Green Advantage study guide.	Thirty eight participants successfully completed curricula/course materials. One instructor was trained in capacity building. Forty six participants were trained by instructors at apprenticeship schools and worksites. Forty eight participants received Green Advantage certification.
6	Youthbuild Mclean County	\$100,000	\$100,000	NCCER – Your Role in the Green Environment curriculum, Home Energy Rating System curriculum, Solar (Photovoltaic) Installation curriculum, Environmental Science curriculum.	Grant is complete. Home Energy Rating System training for staff (Fall/Spring 09-10), Home Energy Rating System for students (Spring 2010), Home Energy Rating System internships (Summer 2010), Rater placement (Fall 2010).
7	Apprenticeship And Nontraditional Employment For Women	\$100,000	\$100,000	Revise existing curriculum to add the Green Jobs curriculum developed by OTI; imbed this training within the core training for Construction Readiness. Develop a video and website.	Grant activities ended May 31, 2011. To date, 150 women have received the green curriculum training. This is 150 percent of the trainee goal for the grant. • Apprenticeship And Nontraditional Employment For Women and Helmets to Hardhats rolled out the Military Occupation Crosswalk project. and completed a “Recruiting and Retaining Women in Washington’s Apprenticeships” booklet for partners. This booklet gives practical tips to recruit, monitor, evaluate and retain female apprentices, as well as links to resources. This booklet will be sustainable beyond this grant as it will be tied to future contractor trainings.

No.	Grantee Name	Grant Award	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
8	Telamon Corporation	\$100,000	\$97,631	Develop a Local Green Jobs Resource Guide (LGJRG) including competency models and career ladders inherent to the local economy.	Senior Certified Sustainability Professional Course has been completed. Instructional Design/ Curriculum Development have been completed. Cross referenced local labor markets with ONET information on In Demand Green Jobs. Trained 42 trainers, support staff and program managerial staff on the modules. The modules were tested on 84 farm workers meeting 98.8 percent of our goal of 85.
9	Improved Solutions For Urban Systems, Inc.	\$100,000	\$100,000	Develop a competency-based curriculum for green collar job training in energy efficient and renewable energy careers, train participants in one or greener collar areas leading to industry recognized certifications and credentials.	Improved Solutions For Urban Systems, Inc. had over 75 Participants in the program. As of December 2010, there were 48 participants still enrolled. Forty three participants have received certifications. Two participants have been placed in jobs. Plant & Environmental Science program participants landscaped two homes and two parks, and are currently working on construction of three homes, each incorporating different energy efficiency and renewable energy systems.
10	Connection Training Services	\$100,000	\$95,587	Update competency models, curriculum materials and career ladders. Develop outreach materials.	Construction Firms contacted and surveyed. Solar Panel Installation Firms contacted and surveyed. Weatherization Firms contacted and surveyed. The training of 30 YouthBuild participants was completed in NCCER basic construction and green construction using the new curriculum. Thirty three new YouthBuild students are participating in the 2nd cohort and will be trained in green construction techniques in 2011. The Philadelphia Workforce Investment Board has prepared a report of the Hot Jobs in Philadelphia 2010. Connection Training Services has finished preparing its green construction curriculum with NCCER national certification.

No.	Grantee Name	Grant Award	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
11	Experience Works, Inc.	\$100,000	\$97,602	Create the Developing Green Industry Sector Strategies for Employment of Older Adults program and curricula. Deliverables will consist of a curriculum, student workbook, instructor guide and PowerPoint slides for use in webinars.	Two hundred and ninety four staff received Green Jobs Capacity Building training. Experience Works staff provided the training to 562 participant assistants. Developed training curriculum with the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning and preparing to train instructors to deliver training to State Directors and State Managers. Provided "Developing Green Industry Sector Strategies for Employment of Older Adults" webinar training to directors and managers. A cumulative total of 856 staff and Senior Care Subsidized Employment Program participant assistants received training in the green jobs curriculum.
12	Year One, Inc. dba Mile High Youth Corps	\$99,855	\$96,038	Modify existing construction curriculum and construction learning lab components to focus primarily on green building techniques, and new green building curriculum. Add certification components and offer to students.	Modifications to PACT curriculum and RRCC curriculum are complete. Further modifications were made to incorporate the additional curriculum and resources made available through this grant. Instructors trained in this quarter: 1 staff trained as a trainer in OSHA 10-hour and OSHA 30-hour ; 1 staff trained and able to certify students in NCCER's Your Role in the Green Environment; 1 staff trained as a BPI Building Analyst; 1 staff trained in Multi-Craft Core Curriculum. Thirty two students participated in the advanced training opportunities of solar installation made possible through this grant. This fell slightly short of the projected goal of 36 YouthBuild participants receiving advanced training.
13	Goodwill Industries of the Conemaugh Valley, Inc.	\$99,524	\$99,524	Curriculum modifications – by adding specialized training in the identified green construction-related occupations to the construction training already received.	All original workshops/trainings have occurred with an additional two courses in Weatherization I and II being offered through the no cost extension. All Weatherization 26 students and 2 staff received the PA Department of Labor Weatherization certification. Coordination with building partners on green capacity building (weatherization; building materials recovery/reuse) continues. Recovery/reuse and weatherization techniques occur at all YouthBuild Johnstown worksites.

No.	Grantee Name	Grant Award	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
14	San Gabriel Valley Conservation and Service Corps	\$98,122	\$98,122	Develop a three-unit, 12-lesson curriculum in solar energy, weatherization, and energy efficiency assessment that will offer participants the opportunity to obtain college credit and national certifications. Develop hands-on, learning lab curriculum in energy auditing, weatherization, and energy efficiency auditing.	The San Gabriel Valley Conservation and Service Corps entered into an agreement with our curriculum team to develop the Solar, Weatherization and Energy Audit curriculum. The curriculum has been completed as of March 31, 2011. We have secured the weatherization training materials. The solar panels and solar panel training equipment have been acquired. Three of our YouthBuild members have completed solar and weatherization training. They are expected to begin assisting in the solar training of other participants. Also completed the construction of the training kits for the solar panels and are prepared for the youth to install the panels once the training commences. The curriculum has been completed. Status of deliverables is at 83.3 percent.
15	Comprehensive Community Solutions, Inc.	\$97,868	\$96,050	Develop curriculum, trainee materials, and trainer materials in green deconstruction, environmental/Brownfield remediation, and weatherization and energy conservation. Develop a written report on available green sector jobs in the Rockford region, including a comprehensive listing of occupational requirements and available education and training programs. Develop and launch a website to track green jobs.	The CCS Green Team approved the deconstruction curriculum and training program offered by The Re-Use People of America. CCS will be working with this group in finalizing its Green Jobs Website, and making policy recommendations on green jobs to the Boone-Winnebago Workforce Investment Board.
16	Episcopal Community Services of Maryland	\$97,128	\$97,128	Develop Hybrid Deconstruction Curriculum Materials, Expanded Job Opportunities, Workplace Certifications, and Career Ladder developing in Energy Efficiency Occupations.	The creation of a Green Deconstruction/Construction Manual, providing a model curriculum for distribution, is in the process of being completed within the next quarter.

No.	Grantee Name	Grant Award	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
17	Blackfeet Tribal Business Council	\$96,257	\$96,257	Install one solar and one wind alternative energy system each year into residential homes on the Blackfeet reservation as an integral element of the YouthBuild coursework.	All 3 energy training and installations were completed on the homes that were audited in the beginning of the summer. The components were energy audit, solar energy and wind energy. The students finished all three areas where they learned about each component all together the students received 120 hours of hands on experience and classroom work. The instructors were from the Montana State University – Technology of Great Falls, Great Falls Montana. The instructors received their training from Madison Area Technical College and the Midwest Renewable Energy association. The college had faculty and adjunct faculty where the instructors received their training.
18	Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County	\$85,910	\$82,462	Create career pathways in energy efficiency and renewable energy/solar sectors. Integrate the Home Energy Rating System (HERS) curriculum into the existing YouthBuild training curriculum. Develop new solar energy curriculum. A vocational education center for the city of Santa Rosa and county of Sonoma.	Over the past year, several program enhancements were instituted and additional supports that would facilitate the participating youths' successful engagement in the program and improve their future prospects. These include: the co-location of an AOD (Alcohol and Other Drug) Counselor at the site for four hours per week, provision of health services in the form of having a school nurse on site for 3 hours per week; establishment of a mentoring component; provision of a parenting class on site once a week for youth who are parents and martial arts classes. Beginning on May 20th, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #551 began delivering Solar Photovoltaic Design and Installation class to 11 youth in the YouthBuild program and the Pre-YouthBuild class. The youth who successfully complete the class will be able to apply to the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #551 as apprentices.

No.	Grantee Name	Grant Award	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
19	Youthbuild USA, Inc.	\$78,047	\$35,979	Build a green resource library and acquire a green training curricula and equipment.	<p>Grant goals included building the institutional capacity to provide training to instructors and students. Both goals have occurred and in the process six homes have been weatherized and “green” building techniques have been taught. Additional goals met include training additional instructors, building a five-star energy certified home and certifying students in the NCCER green curricular model, and insulation training as well as capacity through AmeriCorps to do green space enhancements in the community. Additional goals met included (1) The number of instructors who participated in grant-funded capacity building activities; 8 (2) The number of students subsequently trained by those instructors; 52 and (3) The number of other people participating and/or benefiting from capacity building activities 70.</p>
20	Community Teamwork, Inc.	\$77,585	\$77,585	<p>Develop a new Green Jobs Module within the curriculum of the existing YouthBuild program and establish a green career ladder. Construction of a 5 Kilowatt Solar Lab simulator that will ensure the sustainability of training.</p>	<p>Completed activities as outlined in our timeline submitted in our grant. Deliverables are 1) Construction of Solar Lab- 100% complete; additional supplies and materials list has been developed. 2) Construction Staff to complete Training Partner Solar Panel Array Installer Employee training is 100% complete. 3) Delivery of workshops on solar panel array installation to participants-100% completion; 4) Participant on-the-job training with training partner- 100% completion 5) Participant access to training partner Solar Panel Array Installer Employee training (Sun Portal)- 100% completion 6) Green Jobs Module Curriculum development- 100% complete 7) Construction staff Green Certification attainment- 100% complete 8) YouthBuild students obtain Green Advantage Certification-0%; students required intensive instruction to be prepared that extended beyond the grant cycle.</p>

No.	Grantee Name	Grant Award	Amount Expended	Proposed Deliverables	Summary Status of Reported Deliverables
21	Walker Montgomery Community Development Corporation	\$75,000	\$74,219	Upgrade the green building curriculum at the Raven School to include occupational skills training in the areas of weatherization installers, energy auditors (including the use of blower door), and an overview of the entire range of career paths in emerging Green Building (GB) occupations. Build one model Green Build home at the end of the 12th month.	Walker Montgomery Community Development Corporation met and exceeded all performance measures in the implementation of the DOL Green Building Capacity Building Project. Project staff completed Green Interactive Classroom for Building and Trades Students. The Youthbuild students assisted in completing three new homes with green building features for low-income families. Project consultant completed the Model Home with Green building features. Model home will be used in the classroom and on-site for instruction of students using hands- on and visual approach to learning about Green Building features. Through the end of May 2011, a total of 56 young people have been enrolled in Green Building Program, of which 27 have completed their General Equivalency Diploma. A total of 14 have been employed with trade related jobs.
22	Co-Opportunity, Inc.	\$69,933	\$0	Integrate deconstruction training into its regular, 10-module Pre-Apprenticeship Certification Training (PACT) curriculum for YouthBuild Hartford (YBH) participants. The grantee will also contract to provide two 2-week modules of on-the-job deconstruction training to YBH participants.	YouthBuild Hartford was able to start and complete the Green Jobs - Deconstruction Certification training. Twenty YouthBuild Hartford young people were trained and certified as Deconstruction Technicians. In addition, 6 YouthBuild Hartford young people were trained as crew chiefs.
23	Cook Inlet Tribal Council, Inc.	\$67,268	\$58,598	Update the existing Alaska Works construction curriculum to include an emphasis on weatherization. Update the existing Cook Inlet Housing Authority hands-on construction training to include an emphasis on home weatherization.	This grant was awarded in 2009, and was initially expected to be complete by November 30, 2010. Due to the timeline of our YouthBuild program, the actual completion date ended up being much closer to the deadline. However, Cook Inlet Tribal Council, Inc. was able to meet the original timeline and deliverables.

Appendices

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Background

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley, then Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Finance, requested the Department of Labor, Office of Inspector General conduct an audit of Recovery Act funds spent on Green Jobs. In his request dated October 6, 2010, he requested an audit of Recovery Act funds spent on Green Jobs, and the definition used by the Department for what constitutes a green job, as well as the duration of the jobs created pursuant to the stimulus funds expended.

On February 17, 2009, President Barrack Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act). The purpose of the Recovery Act was to assist those most impacted by the recession and to expend funds as quickly as possible consistent with prudent management. The Recovery Act referred to Section 171(e)(1)(B) of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) or The Green Jobs Act of 2007, and provided the Department with \$500 million designated for projects that prepare workers for careers in energy efficiency and renewable energy sectors.

In addition to the Green Jobs Act of 2007, the definition used by ETA to award Green Jobs grants was derived from the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and information obtained from the O*NET, a database of occupational requirements and worker attributes. Details of each follow:

The Green Jobs Act of 2007 – established an energy efficiency and renewable energy worker training program. The seven energy efficiency and renewable energy industries are comprised of the following:

1. energy-efficient building, construction, and retrofits;
2. renewable electric power;
3. energy efficient and advanced drive train vehicle;
4. biofuels;
5. deconstruction and materials use industries;
6. energy efficiency assessment serving the residential, commercial, or industrial sectors; and
7. manufacturers that produce sustainable products using environmentally sustainable processes and materials.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 – takes into consideration energy efficiency and renewable energy as follows:

Energy efficiency – (a) Increasing energy efficiency of vehicles, buildings, and industrial processes; (b) Reducing demand of the United States for energy, especially energy from foreign sources; (c) Reducing energy cost and making the economy more efficient and competitive; (d) Improving energy security of the United States; and (e) Reducing environmental impact of energy related activities.

Renewable energy – (a) Increasing conversion efficiency of all forms of renewable energy through improved technologies; (b) Decreasing cost of renewable energy generation and delivery; (c) Promoting diversity of the energy supply; (d) Decreasing dependence of the United States on foreign energy supplies; (e) Improving United States energy security; (f) Decreasing environmental impact of energy related activities; and (g) Increasing export of renewable generation equipment from the United States.

O*NET – The National Center for O*NET Development prepared a research paper “Greening of the World of Work,” which reflected three general categories of occupations: (1) existing occupations expected to experience primarily an increase in employment demand; (2) existing occupations with significant change to the work and worker requirements; and (3) new and emerging green occupations. ETA stated that this information was relevant to the understanding of the green jobs parameters that were provided to grant applicants through grant solicitations.

ETA awarded these funds under five different types of competitive grant programs; including Energy Training Partnership (ETP), State Energy Sector Partnership (SESP), Pathways out of Poverty, State Labor Market Information (State LMI), and Green Capacity. ETP, Pathways out of Poverty and SESP are training grants that prepare individuals for careers in energy efficiency and the renewable energy sectors. State LMI grants are to collect, analyze, and disseminate labor market information, and to enhance the labor exchange infrastructure for careers within the renewable energy and energy efficiency industries. Green Capacity grants strengthen grantee’s training program through the purchase of equipment, staff professional development, curriculum development, partnership development, and hiring of additional staff.

Appendix B**Objectives, Scope, Methodology, and Criteria**

Objectives

We conducted an audit of ETA's Green Jobs program as part of our audit oversight responsibilities and in response to a request from the Honorable Charles E. Grassley, then Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Finance. To this end, we developed the following audit objectives:

- How has ETA defined green jobs?
- What is the status of funds expended, and how have grant funds been used?
- To what extent have ETA and grantees reported achieving performance targets for training and placement of workers, and employment retention?

Scope

The scope of the audit covered the \$500 million authorized by the Recovery Act and included grantees' reported data to ETA as of June 30, 2011¹. These grants were awarded December 2009 and January 2010, with various grant end dates ranging from November 2010 through January 2013. Our audit was not designed to, and we did not, perform a financial audit of the amounts obligated or expended, nor did we verify the performance outcomes data reported.

We considered whether internal controls significant to the monitoring of grantees were properly designed and placed in operation. We confirmed our understanding of these controls and procedures through interviews and review of ETA's policies and procedures.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Methodology

The grants were reviewed to determine the period of performance, types of training, milestones and outcomes. We reviewed Quarterly Financial Reports to determine the status of funds expended, Grants E-Management System (GEMS) to determine the extent of monitoring performed, and interviewed ETA national and regional officials. For

¹ The original scope was updated from September 30, 2010 to June 30, 2011, to provide the most current data available as of the report date.

training grants, we reviewed Quarterly Performance Reports to obtain reported performance outcomes related to training and job placement of participants, and analyzed progress to date. For non-training grants, we reviewed Quarterly Narrative Reports to gain an understanding of how grant funds were used. We conducted field work at ETA headquarters in Washington, D.C.

In performing the audit, ETA provided us with a detailed listing of all Green Jobs grant awards. We performed a data reliability assessment to ensure we had complete and accurate grant award data. To determine whether the data was reliable to select our sample, we compared the total of all grant awards on the grant award listing provided by ETA to the amount authorized by the Recovery Act. The difference in the amounts was for program administration and was confirmed by ETA. We reconciled grant amounts to ETA News Releases publicized about the individual grantees within each of the five grant programs. We did not identify any differences. We concluded the data to be sufficiently reliable for our purposes.

To identify and assess internal controls relevant to our audit objectives, we interviewed relevant ETA National and Regional personnel, and reviewed available policies and procedures. In planning and performing our audit, we considered internal controls of ETA's grantee monitoring system by obtaining an understanding and performing an audit of the program's internal controls, determined whether internal controls had been placed in operation, assessed control risk, and performed tests of internal controls in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of achieving our objectives. Our audit covered internal controls over monitoring of grantees in meeting performance outcomes. Our consideration of ETA's internal control for monitoring of grantees would not necessarily disclose all matters that might be significant deficiencies because of the inherent limitations in internal controls, misstatement, or losses, non compliance may nevertheless occur and not be detected.

To gain a better understanding of the five Green Jobs programs, from the universe of 189 grants we statistically sampled 87 grants (46 percent) to review, totaling \$231 million (47 percent), using a 95 percent confidence level and +/-10 percent sampling precision. The universe of 189 grants was stratified into three types of grants including Training, State LMI, and Green Capacity. Training grants were further stratified into three different types of training programs including ETP, SESP, and Pathways. From each stratum a sample of grants was selected using a simple random sampling approach as follows:

Size of Audit Sample and Universe for Training and Non-Training Grants		
	Sample Size	Universe Size
Training Grants		
SESP	13	34
Pathways	17	38
ETP	10	25
Training Grant Subtotal	40	97
Non-Training Grants		
State LMI	24	30
Green Capacity	23	62
Non-Training Grant Subtotal	47	92
Training and Non-Training Grant Total	87	189

For training grants, total sample size was 40 out of 97. For non-training grants, total sample size was 47 out of 92. We reviewed 24 of the 30 State LMI grants. Based on a review of the initial 30 percent of the Green Capacity sampled grant, we found a zero percent error rate. We determined that had we continued our review, we would have found a similar error rate throughout the sample testing therefore we discontinued with our sample testing of the Green Capacity grant. The results of this sample testing were not projected to the universe of grants.

Criteria

We used the following criteria to accomplish our audit:

- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, dated February 17, 2009
- Green Jobs Act of 2007, dated July 27, 2007
- ETA's Core Monitoring Guide
- Energy Policy Act of 2005, dated August 8, 2005
- Employment and Training Order No. 1-08

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix C**Acronyms**

ETA	Employment and Training Administration
ETP	Energy Training Partnership
FY	Fiscal Year
GEMS	Grants E-Management System
Green Capacity	Green Capacity Building
HVAC	Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning
OIG	Office of Inspector General
O*NET	Occupational Information Network
Pathways	Pathways Out of Poverty
Recovery Act	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009
SESP	State Energy Sector Partnership
State LMI	State Labor Market Information
WIA	Workforce Investment Act

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ETA Response to Draft Report

U.S. Department of Labor

Assistant Secretary for
Employment and Training
Washington, D.C. 20210



SEP 26 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR: ELLIOT P. LEWIS
Assistant Inspector General for Audit
Office of the Inspector General

FROM: JANE OATES *Jane Oates*
Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training
Employment and Training Administration

SUBJECT: Response to Draft Report No. 18-11-004-03-390
"Recovery Act: Slow Pace Placing Workers into Jobs
Jeopardizes Employment Goals of the Green Jobs
Program"

We acknowledge the complexity of conducting an audit of program activity that is in progress and appreciate the willingness of the OIG audit team to receive additional performance information as it became available.

The OIG examined three areas in its report leading to an overall conclusion that the Assistant Secretary should evaluate the Green Jobs Program; and in so doing, obtain a current estimate of the Green Jobs funds each grantee requires, and if grantees fail to utilize their grants, ETA would terminate the grants and return the money to the U.S. Treasury.

ETA strongly disagrees with the OIG's conclusion that "there is no evidence that grantees will effectively use the funds and deliver targeted employment outcomes by the end of the grant period." Evidence demonstrates that grantees are effectively using funds. As of June 30, 2011, grantees have reported significant increases in performance outcomes over those initially reported at the start of the audit work. We expect performance to significantly increase over time following an initial lag during that standard start-up phase of the grants. In addition, ETA has put in place appropriate measures to monitor progress and provide robust technical assistance to help ensure ultimate grant success for those that may be at-risk of not delivering all of their outcomes. In addition, ETA is evaluating the outcomes and impact of these grants through qualitative and random assignment evaluations.

At this time, ETA has obligated all of its Recovery Act funds and does not intend to return any money to the U.S. Treasury. ETA's intention is that all funds that are the subject of this Report will have been expended by September 30, 2013, as required by OMB Memorandum M-11-34 (9/15/11), which mandates that Recovery Act funds "not spent by September 30, 2013, . . . shall [be] reclaim[ed] to the extent permitted by law."

(See Memorandum M-11-34 attached). ETA will continue to work with grantees to help them meet program objectives and expend their funds within the OMB-required period. If a grantee has not expended all ARRA funds by September 30, 2013, despite ETA's requirements that it do so, those funds shall be reclaimed, as required. ETA responses to the three areas explored in this audit are outlined below and supplementary information is attached.

Objective 1. ETA defined green jobs as jobs associated with products and services that use renewable energy resources, reduce pollution, and conserve natural resources.

ETA Response: ETA does not define industries or occupations; this is not part of its mission or functions. However, ETA does use definitions for green jobs as set forth through legislation, or established by other agencies and industry when providing guidance to grantees or grant applicants. ETA notes that the definition of "green jobs" is an emerging concept. There is not a single overarching definition for these jobs, but there are a number of defining parameters that the ETA referenced when making grant awards. ETA suggests that the report clarify this.

Objective 2. Of the \$490.1 million of grants awarded, \$162.8 million (33 percent) had been spent while 73 percent of the grant period had elapsed as of June 30, 2011.

ETA Response: The report cites expenditure amounts for each SGA type in assessing the progress of the grant. When assessing the financial status of the grants, the OIG should use obligations as a primary indicator in addition to expenditures. Obligations provide a more current measure of grantee financial status, since they reflect both grantee expenditures to date as well as their immediate plans for expenditures. Based on grantee quarterly financial reports for the quarter ending June 30, 2011, the following are the amount of obligations reported for each type of Green Jobs SGA:

- Green Capacity Building grants: 92.9%
- Labor Market Information Improvement grants: 88.1%
- Energy Training Partnership grants: 62.2%
- Pathways out of Poverty grants: 64.1%
- State Energy Sector Partnership (SESP) grants: 65.6%

As this data indicates, grantee expenditures and planned expenditures are actually much more closely aligned with the grant period than is reflected in the OIG report. ETA suggests that the OIG amend the report accordingly.

The OIG aggregates grantee information on expenditures across all categories of grants referenced in this report, and then reports a blended total amount (an expenditure amount of 32% is noted on p.2). The OIG uses a similar approach in reporting on grantee program performance in other sections of the report.

The grants have varying end dates depending on the type of grant and when awarded. They also have different objectives and different structures (e.g. the SESP grants were

awarded to states, which in turn provided funds to local areas, as opposed to some Pathways Out of Poverty grants which were awarded directly to the local delivery level). Given these factors, ETA suggests that the grant types be evaluated and reported on separately, rather than aggregated into one set of statistics.

Furthermore, the report states that ETA awarded grants totaling \$490.1 million, and “retained the remaining \$9.9 million for other services such as program administration and technical assistance.” That is not an accurate description of ETA’s funding of program administration and technical assistance related to ARRA grants. Program Administration and technical assistance funds were set aside by ETA and used for the total \$750 million Program of ARRA Competitive Grants. The correct amounts for program administration and technical assistance in support of the overall \$750 million are: \$7.5 million for administration, and an additional \$9.4 million for technical assistance, which included support to the Occupational Information Network System (O*NET), building the performance reporting system, and providing programmatic technical assistance for the grants awarded out of the total \$750 million. The support for O*NET includes collecting information on identified new and emerging occupations related to renewable energy and energy efficiency, and updating tools and technology information for existing occupations with changing skill requirements.

Objective 3. ETA and grantees have reported achieving limited performance targets for serving, placing and retaining workers; and risk not delivering targeted outcomes timely.

ETA Response: To date, the ARRA HGEI grants have made significant progress. As of June 30, 2011, grantees have reported significant increases in performance outcomes over those initially reported at the start of the audit work. The three types of training grants started in January 2010, and grants generally have three to nine months of start up activities to complete before they start serving and training participants. We expect performance for these training grants to significantly increase over time following an initial lag during the start-up phase. In addition, there are appropriate measures in place to monitor progress and provide technical assistance to help ensure ultimate grant success for those that may be at-risk of not delivering all of their outcomes within the grant period. ETA asks that the OIG adjust its report to reflect that the grants have made significant progress.

OIG concludes that based on the current statistics for grantee retentions “there is a trend that calls into doubt ETA’s ability to achieve significant placement of workers into stable green jobs.” This text and data are misleading. Due to the timeframe for reporting the “Retained Employment” data element, there is a 6 month lag between when an individual is reported as successfully completing the education/training program and obtaining employment, and when employment retention is reported. The data reflect outcomes as of June 30, 2011; employment retention reported for this quarter includes participants that were reported as entered employment as of 12.31.2010. As a result, employment retention data reflect retention rates achieved for participants completing training and employed within the first 12 months of grant activity, including the traditional start phase and for most grantees, the early stages of training activities. It is

not surprising that grantees have relatively low retention rates as of June 30, given the status of their grants and how this figure is calculated. ETA asks that this section be amended accordingly.

OIG also concluded that ETA cannot adequately measure grantee performance or hold grantees accountable. However, ETA does hold grantees accountable and this should be reflected in the report. ETA holds the grantees to all projected performance outcomes that are included in their statement of work. The Solicitation for Grant Applications asked applicants to provide outcome projections for a standard list of outcome categories (such as the number of participants that begin training and the number that complete training). Progress toward attainment of the goals on these measures is captured through the program performance data that each grantee submits. Therefore, while a grantee may not have provided an outcome projection for one specific category, ETA still monitors the grantee's progress on that measure through the performance reporting requirements. Further, ETA still holds the grantees accountable for all the outcome projections that they did provide. Finally, all ETA grantees are held accountable through numerous federal requirements that make up our grant management system as a whole. In cases where the grantee consistently underperforms, even after technical assistance has been provided, it may be necessary for the federal project officer to require a corrective action plan, or CAP. In instances where reporting of financials are consistently in error the Grant Officer may implement a draw-down restriction, limiting available funds, until the errors are corrected or invoices are approved. These actions are rare, but possible as a part of overall grant accountability. The report suggests that ETA does not 'hold grantees accountable,' which we believe is inaccurate.

ETA has comprehensive plans for monitoring and providing targeted and comprehensive technical assistance to these grants, which it has been implementing. ETA reviews grantee performance regularly and has provided grantees with extensive technical assistance and monitoring to help them meet their outcomes. This includes desk reviews and monitoring which is provided by ETA staff. It also includes extensive, specialized technical assistance on key program-related topics such as effective placement strategies and working with hard-to-serve populations.

ETA strongly disagrees with the OIG's conclusion that "there is no evidence that grantees will effectively use the funds and deliver targeted employment outcomes by the end of the grant period." Evidence demonstrates that grantees are effectively using funds. The OIG report states that grants have served over 52,000 participants, provided training to over 46,600 participants, and that over 8,000 participants have entered employment. Furthermore, these data do not reflect all of the outcomes associated with services to incumbent workers that comprise a significant percentage (about 40 percent) of those trained through these grants. Incumbent workers are receiving critical training through these grants to help them retain their jobs, obtain new work, or otherwise upgrade their skills. Given the start date of the grants and phased activities, these accomplishments are significant and appropriate to the grant cycle.



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

THE DIRECTOR

September 15, 2011

M-11-34

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

FROM: JACOB J. LEW 
DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: Accelerating Spending of Remaining Funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act for Discretionary Grant Programs

In light of the current economic climate and the urgent need to put Americans back to work, it is imperative that we exhaust all available options to drive the economy forward and create jobs. That is why the President submitted the American Jobs Act to Congress on September 12th, 2011, which will put more people back to work and more money in the pockets of working Americans. And that is why we must also ensure that existing Government programs are doing everything to ensure that funds are spent as quickly and efficiently as possible to drive job creation right now.

On February 17, 2009, the President signed into law the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Pub. L. No. 111-5 ("Recovery Act"). As the Congress made clear in enacting the Recovery Act, two of its primary purposes have been to "preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery" and to "assist those most impacted by the recession." To that end, the Congress directed the President and the heads of Federal departments and agencies ("agencies") to "manage and expend the funds made available in this Act so as to achieve the purposes [of the Act], including commencing expenditures and activities as quickly as possible consistent with prudent management."

In underscoring the importance of spending Recovery Act funds quickly and efficiently, the President established a goal that by September 30, 2010, 70 percent of Recovery Act funding should be spent (i.e., both obligated and outlayed). That goal was met, and this focused implementation has been instrumental in driving the positive effects of the Recovery Act on the economy and job creation. According to the most recent report from the Congressional Budget Office, the Recovery Act has raised real GDP by as much as 2.5 percent compared to what it otherwise would have been, lowered the unemployment rate by as much as 1.6 percent, and increased the number of people employed by nearly three million.

Nearly 85 percent of Recovery funds have now been paid out and the vast majority of remaining funds have already been obligated for projects that communities are counting on for job creation. Despite the rapid pace of spending of Recovery Act funds over the past 30 months, there remain billions in discretionary Recovery Act funds that, although they have been obligated, have not yet been outlayed. In light of the current economic situation and the need for further economic stimulus, it is critical that agencies spend these remaining funds as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Accordingly, subject to the exceptions described below, Federal agencies are hereby directed to accelerate the spending of remaining Recovery Act funds in discretionary grant programs (including formula grant programs that received discretionary funding in the Recovery Act), consistent with existing laws and regulations and programmatic objectives. If those funds have not been spent by September 30, 2013, agencies shall reclaim them to the extent permitted by law.

Acceleration of Unspent Discretionary Grant Funds

In order to ensure that remaining Recovery Act balances are spent in an expeditious fashion, Federal agencies should establish aggressive targets, consistent with programmatic objectives, for outlaying remaining funds. To that end, subject to certain exceptions, Federal agencies are directed to take steps to complete Recovery Act projects by September 30, 2013. This new policy would compress the period of availability for the bulk of remaining funds in discretionary grant programs into the next two years.

In executing this policy, Federal agencies should work collaboratively and transparently with recipients of discretionary Recovery Act grants to accelerate the spending rate for all awarded funds while still achieving core programmatic objectives. Agencies are encouraged to reduce administrative hurdles that can delay expenditure of funds, as well as decrease delays between receipt of invoices and outlaying corresponding funds. In addition, agencies should implement programmatic safeguards to protect against unnecessary delays that would otherwise extend current spending timelines beyond the new deadline established in this memorandum. Although this policy is limited to discretionary Recovery Act grant programs, agencies should also establish appropriate safeguards for ensuring the integrity of current spending timelines for other types of Federal assistance and contracts, and encourage the acceleration of spending for these funds as well where possible.

Federal agencies may request waivers from the September 30, 2013 deadline for discretionary grant funds where contractual commitments by the grantee with vendors or sub-recipients prevent adjusting the timeline for spending, where a project must undergo a complex environmental review that cannot be completed within this timeframe, where programs are long-term by design (such as the majority of the High Speed Rail program) and therefore acceleration would compromise core programmatic goals, or where other special circumstances exist. Agencies should request such waivers sparingly, and they will be granted only due to compelling legal, policy, or operational challenges. Agencies must submit all proposed waivers to OMB for review and approval by September 30, 2012. Any waiver requests must be made directly by the head of the agency.

Agencies should clearly communicate the requirements of this memorandum to grant recipients through adding these requirements to new grant agreements, modifying terms and conditions of existing grant agreements, or other appropriate written means consistent with law.

Reclamation of Unspent Discretionary Grant Funds after Deadline

Agencies should revise the terms of Recovery Act discretionary grant agreements, to the extent permitted by law, to provide for reclamation of funds that remain unspent after September 30, 2013, absent a waiver issued by OMB pursuant to this memorandum.

Section 1306 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203, amended Title XVI of the Recovery Act to require the rescission and return to the General Fund of the Treasury certain funds that a Federal agency “withdraws or recaptures for any reason” and that “have not been obligated by a State to a local government or for a specific project.” Agencies should consider whether this rescission-and-return requirement would apply to unspent Recovery Act funds for discretionary grant programs that are reclaimed under the policy set forth in this memorandum.

By September 30, 2012, agencies must submit to OMB any waiver requests from this policy and have established a process for the reclamation of funds and suspension of activities for balances that remain unspent after September 30, 2013 and are not subject to a waiver.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix E

Acknowledgements

Key contributors to this report were Mark Schwartz, Cardelia Tsoi, Charmaine Thorne, Eliacim Nieves-Perez, John Schick, Nadeem Afzal, Reza Noorani, Mary Lou Casazza, and Ajit Buttar.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TO REPORT FRAUD, WASTE OR ABUSE, PLEASE CONTACT:

Online: <http://www.oig.dol.gov/hotlineform.htm>
Email: hotline@oig.dol.gov

Telephone: 1-800-347-3756
202-693-6999

Fax: 202-693-7020

Address: Office of Inspector General
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Room S-5506
Washington, D.C. 20210