



Bluegrass Workforce Innovation Board Full Board Meeting
March 14, 2017
Bluegrass Area Development District
Lexington, KY

Board Members Present	Staff Present
Boggs, David	Duke, Mable
Dougherty, Jon	Glasscock, Amy
Farmer, Lisa	Wilson, Megan
Hollan, Dolly	Wright, Katie
Menke, Kim	Reeves, Tiffanie
Julian, Dr. Augusta	Duttlinger, David
Leary, Brian	Bushman, Michael
Montgomery, Matt	
Oney, Regina	
Phillips, John	
Troske, Ken	
	Guests Present
	Beck, Adam
	Pryor, Michael
	Murray, Natasha
	O'Neill, Beth

I. Call to Order

a. Establish Quorum

Chair Menke established that there was a quorum present.

b. Introduction of Board Members and Guests

Chair Menke allowed all members and guests present to introduce themselves.

c. Minutes from February 21st Full Board Meeting

Chair Menke allowed all members to review the minutes from the previous full board meeting. A motion was then made for approval.

Motion: To approve the February 21st Full Board meeting.

Motion by: Dr. Ken Troske Second by: Matt Montgomery Motion approved

II. Old Business

a. Monitoring Review/Resolution

Chair Menke asked to discuss the monitoring review. Mable Duke discusses the letter from the state. The responses have been accepted along with the monitoring reviews from last week. The findings were minimal; there were a few issues with paperwork, but the staff was commended. Chair Menke opened up discussion for questions regarding monitoring, to which there were none.

b. OET Reorganization

Ms. Duke covered an overview of the status of the Richmond office. The building was going to be sold, and the new landlord offered them a space within the building, however, the circumstances have changed again. The staff have located a new location in North Berea. Ms. Mable Duke covers the new location and the specifics thereof. Chair asks for an update on the Georgetown space. Ms. Duke said there is no change to the Georgetown location, and that OVR staff was the staff that went through a change in Georgetown, and all workforce staff are operating as normal at the Georgetown location, and it will remain a comprehensive One Stop location.

It is confirmed that there are no rent issues among the offices and locations.

Chair Menke once again opened the discussion up to questions, to which there were none.

c. Youth Proposals – Scoring and Recommendations

Ms. Duke covered the youth proposals that were submitted for both OWL and LEEP rural. The staff recommendation is to not fund LEEP rural at the current time due to one of the current contractors, Fort Logan, being classified as an “In School” contractor. While the BGADD is still awaiting a final word, the BGADD cannot fund the program in order to abide by the laws set forth for the BGADD.

The board discusses Fort Logan and LEEP Rural’s shortfalls and discrepancies.

Mr. Boggs recluses himself and is obtaining from this vote due to potential conflict of interest.

Motion: To accept staff recommendation of funding OWL and not LEEP rural

Motion by: Dr. Ken Troske Second by: Matt Montgomery Motion Approved

d. Transitional Local Plan

Ms. Duke covers the new state issued guidance, due June 30th of this year. She received comments from two board members, which were included in the packet. One comment was to update the business name of an electrical supplier/terminology. Chair Menke's comments were not incorporated, since the BGADD did not receive further direction on how those comments were meant. Ms. Mable Duke stated that this plan is over one and a half years overdue, and advised the board to not spend a long time laboring over this plan.

Chair Menke states he has small concerns, but not major concerns, over this plan.

Ms. Mable Duke stated she believes that this plan will be accepted by the state.

Dr. Augusta Julian asks about the purpose of the Transitional Plan, the Local plan, and their relationship.

Ms. Mable Duke cleared up that this new plan is a four year plan with a regional requirement as required by state law.

Dr. Ken Troske asked for a more robust review of the program going forward, along with a re-evaluation of the programs that they are offering/affording. He asked about behavioral health, drug testing, and moving the focus on building a more rewarding program, and wants the program to move in that direction going forward.

Dr. Augusta Julian talks about helping individual develop robust, well-rounded skills for the job market.

Dr. Ken Troske covered appropriate job behaviors, which Dr. Augusta Julian agreed with. She also suggested these skills are developed within an internship with the promise of a job, payment, etc.

John Dougherty states that people that come into his program are 20 or 30 plus, need to pass a drug screen, and have soft skills.

While this is something not fully expected in youth, it is expected in adults.

Ms. Mable Duke introduces the new plan guidance and the five areas for each local area to address. Ms. Mable Duke asks the board to form a committee to guide that process. She suggests Dr. Troske.

Dr. Ken Troske asks for a motion before moving forward.

Motion: *To accept staff recommendation of funding OWL and not LEEP rural*

Motion by: *Ken Troske* Second by: *Matt Montgomery* Motion Approved

Chair Menke discusses the committee. Ms. Mable Duke gives an overview of our region, states that there is \$50,000 in planning money available to our region. Ms. Mable Duke met with the other Local Area Directors in the region last week. One agent must be the fiscal agent. Michael Gritton was volunteered and accepted the position. Additionally, whomever is hired to do that regional process, would perform it for all four regions. Additionally, the method that Mr. Gritton suggested and that Mable concurs with is to have the committees formed, meet, and have a set of questions answered. Other than forming the committee – this is board driven, and necessary – it is informational only at this point.

The schedule is discussed, and Chair Menke asks the board whether they should use the standing committee or a separate committee for this activity. Ms. Mable Duke suggests an ad hoc committee, but it is ultimately up to the board.

Chair Menke agrees with an ad hoc committee, and asks for a volunteer to chair that committee. Dr. Ken Troske volunteers to chair the committee.

Motion: *To Create Regional Committee*

Motion by: *Chair Menke* Second by: *Dr. Augusta Julian* Motion passed

Chair Menke confirms that Dr. Ken Troske has volunteered, as well as John Phillips, for the committee. Three individuals are suggested, and Brian Leary volunteers.

Dr. Ken Troske asked if there are rules on who can serve, and it is discussed that this can be discussed between regions and current committee members.

e. Board Training Options Update

Ms. Mable Duke stated she had checked with other areas in the state, as well as out of state, for board training providers. Ms. Duke created a list of five frequently-used trainers. In-state trainers did not find the state training helpful for the local area, because it was from the state perspective instead of the local perspective.

Ms. Mable Duke discussed trainers which could potentially cause conflicts of interest.

Chair Menke also stated that since we were doing this for the board, we should extend the offer to the judges so the judges can hear it as well.

Ms. Mable Duke suggested that depending on charge, we should get other proposals as well for procurement.

David Boggs stated in order to get quotes, we would need board approval, dates available, and prices.

Ms. Mable asks if April 15, 2017 to May 15, 2017 is still an appropriate date range for training.

Motion: To acquire proposals for a board trainer and training to take place before May 1, 2017

Motion by: David Boggs Second by: Dr. Ken Troske Motion passed

Ms. Mable Duke stated that Tracy Pratt-Savage asked we put together information on the current service model of how they currently operate, and how it is being proposed the BGADD will operate under the new RFP.

Ms. Mable Duke covers a short presentation on how the BGADD operates, and how it the new model will operate under the proposed RFP.

f. Partnership Agreement

Chair Menke states that he wants to set some context on this agenda item. This issue needs to be resolved, and there is a fundamental difference between the board and the LEOs. Both have the same intent, but the interpretation centering around responsibility and control is what he believes is the main difference in where they are and how they want to move forward. They want to be a model, not a negative example. Many have agreed to serve on the board at an invitation from the LEOs, so that they do not fall into the status quo, but can move forward in order to serve the customers using the new law to its fullest extent. It's a partnership in order to make it happen. Agreements have been reached during the year with best practices in mind, starting with the attorneys.

These things have been discussed in boards even prior to WIOA. The previous board hired an attorney to make sure all interests were considered moving forward appropriately.

WIOA provides for very specific goals, and Adam (Adam Beck) has provided documents for those as a part of training. The board has been working through the issues, and one of the main issues is making sure that the board's interpretations are appropriate. Mr. Beck has worked with staff attorneys, as well as the cabinet, so that the board is in concert with what is going on.

There was a lot of conversation previously about the board's and LEO's previous partnership agreement not being in conformance with the law. There was direction from the LEO governing board to look at a different partnership agreement developed by Ms. Mable Duke.

A lot of what Chair Menke and Adam Beck were hearing was not necessarily consistent with their understanding of current activity. In business, you trust, but confirm. Chair Menke and Adam Beck, on February 22, 2017 had a conference call with Beth Kuhn and Tess Russell, in which they discussed the comments they heard about during the last meeting. The comments contributed to the cabinet generally, Beth specifically, concerning partnership agreements, and the comments about the board's partnership agreement and the LEO's partnership agreement not complying with the law. Commissioner Kuhn said she had not reviewed either drafts of the partnership agreement, and did not provide comments about the substance, and did not set any deadlines from the state perspective, although they all agree it needs to be done as quickly as possible. Ms. Russell had reviewed the latest partnership agreement that was submitted in December to the LEO's, and the only change she suggested based on a new requirement for our

board, that basically control over the expenditure over workforce funds needs to be included in that document, and the cabinet would not approve any document that did not have those statements in there. Recognizing that the disagreement would still exist about the definition of control and responsibility, Chair Menke requested that the cabinet become more directly involved in finalizing the agreement and any issues around that. Chair Menke wanted to sit down again with the Co-CLEOs to come to a resolution, and make a proposal for a meeting to occur between the board, Co-CLEO's, one or more members of the cabinet, and any other board members in order to come to an agreement on the partnership agreement so there is a model going forward to meet the needs of our customers. Commissioner Kuhn agreed to consider the request and get back to Chair Menke. He has not heard back, however, he has heard there are many new policies that have come out as of yesterday. David was asked to review new policies, since he is also a part of the state board.

David Boggs stated that last Thursday or Friday he received a phone call for an invitation to participate in a policy committee for the Kentucky Workforce Board (which he is already a part of). They had a call on Monday, where two new policies were introduced, which will be commented on today and tomorrow, and which will take effect in the future. One policy, the policy that will deal with the hiring of a workforce/director/staff to perform workforce function, includes language only the local workforce development board may hire a director and or staff to carry out the functions described in WIOA section 107 D. Any individual or organization that serves as a director and or staff to the local workforce board to assist in the local workforce development board in the performance of the functions contained in the WIOA shall not be eligible to serve as a one stop operator and/or a career services provider. If this occurs, the governor decrees this to be an organizational conflict of interest and thus prohibited. The third bullet of this policy says that any provisions and partnership agreements or any other agreements that enables individuals or entity other than a local workforce development board, hired director, or development staff, are no longer valid. That is a new policy that defines one of the things we've often had as a very questionable thing in the partnership agreement. The other policy has to do with entities functioning in a variety of rows, including a fiscal agent, one-stop-operator, and/or career services provider. This relates to Mable's presentation, ensuring there's a firewall that has there's a clear separation of duties and responsibilities, including disclosure agreements. Those two new policies will have an impact on the partnership agreement we've been discussing. We have a couple more new policies that

were just presented this afternoon – a revision of those – and then there is a couple more policies they will be looking at tomorrow. There are a few questions about those policies. Questions have been: Will this language be what is there? We will be discussing this language tomorrow afternoon on a conference call, and then there will be a recommendation by the policy committee to approve these policies. Next question, John? (Which David Boggs addressed to John Phillips) Which I understood, was -- does this have to go before the full workforce board? It does go the board as an informational item?

John Phillips says yes, it does have to go and pushed out to the directors, once the comments are made.

David Boggs reiterates this, and says as far as having to wait until the next state workforce board meeting occurs, it doesn't have to do that – once that meeting occurs, it will take effect as the date they determine, which will probably be this week. Yes.

Ms. Mable Duke says she's listened patiently.

Chair Menke interrupts Ms. Mable Duke, raises his finger and says, "Wait just a minute – wait, just a minute."

Ms. Mable Duke says "No, you can wait just a minute, please. I've listened patiently while you've maligned my integrity and everything else. I've had a long and successful career in workforce services and I did not achieve that by lying..."

Chair Menke talks above Ms. Mable Duke, and says, "Mable, you are out of order right now."

...to my boards", Ms. Mable Duke continues.

Chair Menke raises his voice and says, "Mable, Mable, I will recognize you in a moment, OK?"

Chair Menke states that he has a question for Adam Beck to share with the group, and then he will recognize Mable. Then, he asks, as a point of reference, that these policies, and the partnership agreement, how do they fit together in terms of precedence? If we have a partnership agreement that says one thing, and a policy comes out that says something else, what takes precedence?

Mr. Adam Beck says that policy will trump whatever is within the partnership agreement. He is seeing these proposed policies for

the first time. He sees that one of the required actions as part of these proposed policy changes is an amendment to partnership agreements or other agreements. Parties cannot contract around what policies are from on high, so, to more succinctly answer your question; if there's a conflict between a partnership agreement – or any agreement – if there's a policy, the policy would trump it.

Chair Menke thanked Mr. Adam Beck.

Ms. Mable Duke says that what she had told everyone at the last meeting was that she had met with Commissioner Kuhn, and she had discussed and walked her through each policy, each partnership agreement, that they had. She gave the board her precise and exact comments, which were the policy that was presented by the WIB to the LEOs in December was not in compliance with the law. She also walked Commissioner Kuhn through the Partnership Agreement that Ms. Mable Duke wrote. It is a very simple, basic agreement, which is taken directly from the law, with the one exception, which is not addressed in the law, which is that the LEOs, which are solely liable for the Workforce Investment Act funds, would also, in addition to appointing the fiscal agent, would appoint the sub-grant recipient, which would be the entity providing administrative oversight.

Ms. Mable Duke thinks that if you think about that, it only makes sense. She doesn't think any of the board would want to be liable for money with no control over how it is spent. The policy that David is referring to, of the two that came out yesterday, one, as he said, simply underscores what Mable mentioned about a separation of direct services and administrative oversight. The other policy is a surprise, and Mable disagrees with Adam. First of all, it is not a policy, it has not been approved, it is a draft that is out for review/comment. It is Ms. Mable Duke's guess that there will be many LEO's that will have comments on that, because in the law, the WIB has sixteen statutory responsibilities. One, this policy addressed six, and it fails to point out, and she directed the board to look at what she passed around, in every single one of those instances, it requires either, in partnership with the chief elective officials, in collaboration with them, by approval of the chief elective officials – every single instance. There is no state policy that is going to be able to strip that right away from the Local Elected Officials against their will. The only way that policy will stand is as if there's no objection to it, which has always been the case. Ms. Mable Duke contends that everyone should stay tuned to see how that plays out. What everyone sees in red on the policy passed around has been pulled directly from the law – nothing has been

changed. Ms. Mable Duke doesn't know what legal advice they're getting. She does not know why state leadership would want to pass such a policy that would put such restrictions on the Local Elected Officials. She doesn't know any that would be that brave and is certain that hasn't happened anywhere else in the entire country. She reiterated this is not a confirmed policy, and it remains to be seen whether that will stand or not, and believes it is solely dependent on the Local Elected Officials' reaction.

Dr. Ken Troske asks a question about a portion of text on the middle of the 2nd page, two sentences, the ones below point seven. Dr. Ken Troske reads the policy, LWDB may hire a director in our staff, asks for a definition of LWDB, then, next, in black, only the workforce board may hire and then can hire. He asks if he's reading that correctly or not.

Ms. Mable Duke says the law gives them the option, and the state policy requires it.

Dr. Ken Troske asks if those are the parts in black are the proposals, because they seem to be inconsistent.

Ms. Mable Duke says those are state policy.

Dr. Ken Troske says they seem inconsistent as one allows them to, and the second says only they can.

Ms. Mable Duke confirms this is the existing state policy.

Dr. Ken Troske asks if he's missing something.

Mr. Adam Beck says that it says what it says, and states that the red are your comments (It's unclear who he is directing this to).

Dr. Ken Troske states those statements are confusing, and he says that Chair Menke and Commissioner Kuhn have discussed meeting in order to consider this request, to which Ms. Mable Duke states is what Commissioner Kuhn also stated to her when they met, as well.

Ms. Mable Duke said that Commissioner Kuhn recommended a resolution.

Dr. Ken Troske asked if there was a reason we haven't taken her up on that as a way to move forward.

Chair Menke says he has asked her that, and that was his request, and suggested many options to consider, and Commissioner Kuhn said she would take it under consideration.

Judge Mike Williams stated that when the funds come into this program – he is the judge in a county of 7,000 people – he agrees with Ken 100%. He doesn't want to go backwards. Mr. Boggs states that when he came on the BGADD had crashed, and now the house is in order. Is everything perfect? Probably not, will changes be made in the future? Probably so, in order to keep things transparent – business is done at the table. We don't make calls, meet upstairs behind the doors, and he's proud of the ADD district. It's a significant organization for his county, and many other counties. This ADD District is here to support small counties like his. He state she hasn't seen any workforce money is his county since he's been alive – there's been some, but not much. He wants this to happen and wants it to happen in all the other counties. He says there's no animosity between the Bluegrass ADD board and the LEOs to the board at all. He wants to see it work, but there is a huge responsibility that falls on the counties about this money. The one thing that is still up in the air, that will be litigated, is 900,000 in disallowed costs. His county could be held for 1/17th of that. It would put his county out of business. It's important to judges that we have input and oversight over what happens. If there is an organization like that has been around in the past, it's their responsibility as judges and LEO's that that money is administrated right. They can talk all day about the past, but he's very concerned about what's happening now. He assures the board has a partner with the LEO's. He wants the board to know we need to come up with a partnership agreement, according to the federal guidelines, but wants good oversight, and if we do not, his county will pay the price. That money that is being discussed needs to be up and running and put into the program to help the people that need help. He talked to a lady this morning who is going to get her GED, and there's so much that can be done that's not being done – he's not being critical, but believes we need to move forward and get this workforce development program and running. He promises the LEO will cooperate. They do not want it to be a contest. It's at the judge's advantage to get this done. The judges responsibility is to the people that this money was appropriated for. Throw the disallowed costs out the window, as it will be handled in another form and fashion. He wants the board to realize, as judges, their concern is to make sure there is a solid agreement that's fair for everyone. They're not asking for preferential treatment. The last thing that a judge wants to do is to run a workforce program. They do not want to run workforce. He says the board needs to get past

the bickering. They want the program to be successful, within controls, to avoid the problems that have happened in the past.

Chair Menke thanks Judge Williams, and says he believes that we are headed in the right direction, however, the law clearly states there is collaboration but also delegation. That's the question, and that's the thing that Chair Menke hopes the state can parse. Chair Menke states he has no intentions of doing anything negative to the workforce efforts in the judge's county or any other court because as the board has always said, it's about the customer, and the customer is the businesses that drive employment, and it's about the citizens that need to be gainfully employed to the highest quality they can.

Judge Williams says they don't want the money to filter through them if they don't have enough oversight and they don't make sure it's administrated correctly? That goes back to the ADD and the Fiscal Agent. He asked the board to be confident that you're dealing with a group of people that want this to be successful. If that wasn't the case, the LEO's would say, go ahead.

Judge Williams said we need to light the fire, to which Kim Menke agrees.

Chair Menke states that he wants to make sure the information is out there, and wants to make sure that the judges are aware of that. He also wants to remind everyone that he charged folks to look at the Partnership Agreement that was put on the table at the last meeting. He thanked the members for the responses, and wanted to walk through the responses to see how it matched up with where the board is headed to make sure everyone is on the same page when the Cabinet is brought in to finalize to make sure there is a common understanding.

Chair Menke asks where the responses are, if they are in the packet. Chair Menke then says to look at the summary document, and asks for any feedback.

Ms. Mable Duke states that there was one comment left off, because the comment was made late yesterday afternoon and the copies were already made. Tracy Pratt-Savage had commented that she approved it.

Chair Menke says that some of the proposed edits in section 4, [Inaudible reading of proposed edits] sub recipient, who shall

provide administrative support from the local workforce system, approve the budget as well, as it is developed by the WIB.

Chair Menke states that part of the partnership agreement moving forward from the board, WIB would procure the administrative services for both the board and the governing board and given the latest conversation that we had with the WIB board would hire the workforce director position. Those would be additions thrown out for discussion based on what they were hearing from the state.

Ms. Mable Duke reminds the board that the LEO Governing board met in February. They approved the partnership agreement as is in the packet, both Co-CLEO's were present. They instructed Mable to present it to this board, and if resolution was not found, then we should proceed, as we've talked about to the state and let them sort it out. The LEO's have approved the partnership agreement as it is. Any changes will have to occur at the state level with Commissioner Kuhn.

Chair Menke asks Judge Williams if this is accurate, to which Judge William confirms that it is. Judge Williams clarified that this was an effort from the judges to abide by the statutes of the laws that were written.

Dr. Augusta Julian states, for clarification, that this Partnership Agreement was not written by the board, to which Chair Menke says no, it was not.

Ms. Mable Duke states that she wrote it in an effort to wind up a year and a half of legal fees and battling versions of the agreement back and forth.

Chair Menke states there is one of his concerns is that the board has the LEO's designating to the ADD employees to draft the Partnership Agreement that basically would preserve, define "Their role" in this activity, which he sees as a conflict of interest.

Ms. Mable Duke states that she was asked to draft a Partnership Agreement in compliance with the law, a very simple document which states what's in the law, with one exception being that the LEOs retain administrative oversight on those funds. That's it.

Judge Williams states he respects Chair Menke's opinion, but the judges had not seen any movement. He's not shoving anything down Chair Menke's throat, they're perfectly fine with getting into serious negotiations and getting it settled. This wasn't an attempt to

get an agreement drafted. The LEOs want administrative oversight because they are where the money stops. It's their responsibility to oversee that. If the board had a group that didn't care again, and then you see that number of country judges get together, that's a significant thing – that's a hard thing to do. They care. This was not an attempt by the LEOs to get someone at the ADD to write an agreement that'd advantageous to the LEOs. This is the first proposal, this is on the table, let's get on down the pipe. If this means getting Frankfort to sit down with us, somebody needs to do it. We have judges with good connections in Frankfort.

Judge Williams once again assures that this wasn't an attempt by the LEO's to get an agreement drafted in their favor. This was not an attempt to pull the wool over anybody's eyes.

Ms. Mable Duke states that as administrative support to both boards, any request to draft partnership agreement or anything else is well within the board's authority to do.

Mr. Kevin Atkins wants to mimic Judge Pryor's position. It was just a good attempt to get the ball rolling again. He thinks this has gone on long enough. The Mayor thinks this has gone on long enough, and believes that "we still need to get it right". He never envisioned this. Yes, it was a unanimous vote, but he didn't think this was the last time he would see that document.

Mr. David Boggs stated that he firmly believes this is fluid, and that today they're talking about new policies, and will have to work with that, and they can do that, and there's no reason why grown people can't come up with a solution to this.

Dr. Ken Troske submitted suggestion changes based on his own opinions. In his view, the best way to move forward in an expedited fashion to get an agreement, is to get folks from LEOs and this board, and the state, together in a meeting and go forward from there.

Motion: *To set up a meeting with the State, LEOs, this board, and Commissioner Kuhn.*

Motion by: *Dr. Ken Troske* Second by: *Dr. Augusta Julian* Motion passed

g. Procurement of One Stop Operator and Direct Service Provider

Chair Menke states the next order of business is the One Stop Operator and Direct Service Provider.

Ms. Mable Duke states that nothing has changed on this subject since the last meeting.

Dr. Ken Troske states he is a little confused, so, he wants to clarify that there's nothing that has been discussed the precludes doing what is within the RFP. HE didn't see anything in the draft documents that prevents him from issuing an RFP for someone to operate both the One Stop Operator and the Provisional Services. It precludes the Fiscal Agent from doing that, but wants to make sure this does not preclude these from being operated together.

Judge Williams states they want a clear firewall and separate duties so there is no conflict of interest. For instance, you cannot have the ADD developing the RFP for these, then bidding on them, or soliciting, and the bid only include one person. What he believes will end up with this, is that it will say you have to have multiple bidders on all the RFPs so there is a delineation of "who dun it". All these RFPs should be coming from the board, and not from the ADD, so that there is no opportunity for there to be a conflict of interest.

Ms. Mable Duke states there is no conflict of interest because this is an RFP for One Stop Operator and direct services provider, and the ADD does not intend to bid on either of those services, so, there is no conflict of interest, nor is there anything in the RFP that the firewall that David had mentioned addresses, specifically...there is nothing in here that would prevent this RFP from moving forward, and she again wants to state that the law requires the One Stop Operator be procured by June 30th. It is Mid-March.

Chair Menke asks about the \$100,000 that's in there, to which Ms. Mable Duke replies that that is a place holder that can be removed. That was in there to make certain, depending on how the bidder addressed it, it would not encompass more than one individual and their benefits, but, it isn't necessary that we specify amount, and they can roll themselves out at any time.

Chair Menke said that's not intended to be cap.

Ms. Mable Duke said, yes, it's a cap, which means not more than that amount would be spent on it. She does not see how you can justify more than one person to function in that

capacity, but that can be left open to the bidder to decide how they want to do it, and can be taken out.

David Boggs states he feels very strongly that this RFP should be coming as created by this board, and this board be responsible for it. The assimilation, scoring, and seeking the expertise of scoring of those.

Ms. Mable Duke says the board would score any proposals as a result of this RFP. There is nothing that would indicate otherwise.

Judge Williams knows that, but he wishes to make it a matter of statement.

Chair Menke asks that throughout the document, as it talks about the BG administrator, is that the board, or a subcommittee of the board, or an executive committee of the board that has that responsibility...

Ms. Mable Duke says the board would approve that contract, the board not have a structure in place to handle the funds, to disperse the funds, other than through the fiscal agent - so grant recipient. The board would approve the selection of the One stop Operator and services provider. They would approve the contract that would go into place with the selected provider. The board is not structured in the capacity to do anything without an entity in place to do that, so just the Bluegrass Add.

As the fiscal agent, Chair Menke states.

Ms. Mable Duke confirms that statement.

David Boggs says that at the beginning of the document, it states that the Bluegrass Workforce Dev. Area is issuing the request for proposals. David Boggs asks for clarifications between the Workforce Development Board and the Bluegrass Area Development District. He directs this at Chair Menke.

Ms. Mable Duke says that this is the Bluegrass Local Area.

Both Ms. Mable Duke, and Chair Menke confirm that this is the 17 counties in the region.

David Boggs states that because this language is in there, that the ADD is issuing this RFP, not the Workforce Board. He asks for clear delineation on that.

Ms. Mable Duke states that this also took a joint vote with the LEO's to go to this service structure, so it's not just the WIB, it would be the Bluegrass Local Workforce Area in totality.

Dr. Julian Agusta asks for confirmation of this as well, which Ms. Mable Duke confirms.

Dr. Ken Troske proposes that we change the wording in the document to reflect to Bluegrass Local Workforce Area.

Dr. Julian Agusta says this is a good idea if that would solve the problem.

Dr. Ken Troske says if someone is making a motion, he would second that motion.

David Boggs states that this is not an entity.

A discussion ensues on what the proper wording and language should be.

David Boggs believes the board is the one issuing this, the LEOs are involved in this process, and are actually responsible for issuing the RFP, and once approved, the other players are involved and have to approve it. David Boggs states that everything that this board does, somewhere along the line, is brought before the LEOs for their approval, not the other way around.

It is agreed that it's a joint effort.

David Boggs states that the federal guidelines – the intent of the law – is that it starts here, they approve it, and the board takes it from there, and goes along with it, unless it's something that needs immediate attention.

Judge Williams agrees, and says that it comes down to the spending and administration of the funds. They want to make sure it's been done appropriately.

Dr. Ken Troske asks if the Bluegrass Workforce Innovation Board is what it should be called due to the responsibilities it carries.

Ms. Mable Duke says she has no problem with that.

Ms. Mable Duke says the only issue she sees is in the instances where it talks about the Bluegrass Administrator, to which Dr. Ken Troske states that he agrees, and confirms that in the document it states that the Bluegrass Administrator is the fiscal agent, as on evidenced on page three, he states.

Chair Menke confirms that there is a motion to vote on, and asks for confirmation that Ms. Mable Duke is clear on that.

Dr. Ken Troske confirms that this is to amend

Motion: Amend the document based on the areas to now read Bluegrass Workforce Innovation Board

Motion by: Dr. Augusta Julian Second by: Dr. Ken Troske Motion passed

Mr. Matt Montgomery states that, if there are no concerns, once the language is amended, the document needs to go out, and time is of the essence.

There is discussion on the next steps once the document is amended.

Motion: Once language is changed, approve RFP

Motion by: Dr. Augusta Julian Second by: Dr. Ken Troske Motion passed

Chair Menke asks for a five-minute break. There is an objection, as one of the board members has to leave. The break is postponed to maintain quorum.

h. Policies Update

Dr. Ken Troske asks if these policies will be done as a packet, but Ms. Mable Duke states she has some feedback.

Chair Menke and Mable Duke cover the general policies that will be discussed. Chair Menke brings up the priority of service policy, and asks for any concerns. There are none.

Dr. Ken Troske asks for a two-sentence overview of the policy. Ms. Mable Duke asks Amy to give them an update. Amy Glasscock states that this is verbatim from the state policy, and covers the update to the policy for low-income individuals. They discuss that this is a revision, and Ms. Mable Duke confirms that this is benchmarked.

The next policy talks about jobs, confirms this is a revision, and is verbatim to states policy.

The state also requested a social media policy specifically for WIOA.

Next policy was the follow-up policy.

Dr. Ken Troske asked for confirmation of the correction of spelling errors.

The next policy is inaudible.

The credential policy is next, and Ms. Amy Glasscock covers the updates to the credential policy.

The internship policy is next, and it is a new policy. This policy originated from Tupelo, Mississippi. This follows their policy directly, and allows for internships, or adult work experience policy, which applies to adults and dislocated workers.

The youth incentive policy, and this changes the policy to match WIOA's policy.

The individual training policy. The amount was increased to go along with the internship and OJT policy, for \$8,500, from \$7,000.

Motion: To approve policies as a packet.

Motion by: Dr. Ken Troske Second by: Mr. Jon Dougherty Motion passed

i. Set 2017 Meeting Dates and Schedule Election of Officers

Chair Menke states that an 11 x 17 sheet will be passed around the table, and discussed last year's survey. This sheet has a breakdown of meetings, and spaces for standing committees, so

that people may sign up. The activity is noted on the right of the blocks, and covers the meetings and joint meeting dates. The whole idea is for the committees to set up meetings and sign up for committees as well, in order to take action and fulfill function. It would be program and function monitoring and reporting back to the executive and full board to get action. There are dates on the sheet to consider.

Dr. Ken Troske asks about the potential dates, as they cover 12 months. Chair Menke chose a Tuesday due to meetings in the past. Chair Menke says that the meetings should be short, and should facilitate getting to the points that Dr. Ken Troske brought up quicker. The executive committee schedule was also proposed, with any special meetings not being included in those dates. He wants to make sure that schedules align so they can get started.

Dr. Ken Troske states those dates work for him. Chair Menke then states that it's important to get around to the areas, so that everyone doesn't have to come to Lexington.

Mr. David Boggs, said, before people start signing, that they include in one of their emails, who can be on what committees, and what's required, so there is not an unfair balance, as in the past, this caused issues. Chair Menke says that the bylaws discuss this. Chair Menke states that all members need to be on at least one committee. There are two positions currently open. Based on past conversations and interest, Dr. Ken Troske was asked to be the organizing chair. Dr. Ken Troske also stated that Ms. Tracy Pratt-Savage was willing to do that, and it was stated that they would contact Ms. Savage. Mr. Jon Dougherty was asked to chair the other committee on One Stop Centers, to which he agreed, with a stipulation for direction. Chair Menke asked the people on the chairs would reach out to the organizing chairs for an information exchange in order to establish the committees and get them up to speed on their roles and responsibilities. Chair Menke also asked everyone to sign up in one area of interest. Program development, both board and staff, finance committee, strategic planning, youth, individuals with disabilities, and one stop centers. He stated he can get the bylaws out again, for clarification and confirmation of the chairs.

Dr. Ken Troske quotes from Ms. Tracy Pratt-Savage's email where she volunteers to organizing.

It is asked if there will be a vote on the dates. Chair Menke states there will be, if people are willing to be there.

The dates are discussed, with different members stating the dates they cannot make it.

Chair Menke has requested the members send back their availability. Chair Menke asked if there was staff here to help with that and help schedule the meetings. Stacy is volunteered.

Ms. Staci May adds that if members have not given her their photograph and bio, she can take it, or schedule it. She also states the new website will be launched before the next website. Several of the pages have been done, but there is still information that needs to be pulled over.

Motion: To adjourn

Motion by: Chair Menke

Second by: Mr. John Phillips

Motion passed