

**KENTUCKIANAWORKS BOARD MEETING**  
**GREATER LOUISVILLE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD**  
**Thursday, November 16, 2017**  
**8:30 A.M.**  
**Greater Louisville Inc.**

**Members Present:**

Tom Quick–*Chair*, Mark Ballard, Derek Bland, Tony Carriss, Dana Crittendon, Steve Cunanan, Tony Georges, Dr. Ty Handy, Tami Hatfield, Ryan Henson, Deana Karem proxy for Kent Oyler, Sadiqa Reynolds, April Troutman, Kristin Wingfeld proxy for Dr. Marty Pollio, Mary Ellen Wiederwohl

**Greetings and Welcome – Tom Quick**

Mr. Quick welcomed everyone @ 8:38 a.m.

**Recognition of Special Guests – Michael Gritton**

Mr. Gritton welcomed Rebel Chreste, the Wagner Peyser representative who will join the Board in early 2018.

**Review and Approve Minutes – Tom Quick**

Approval needed for the minutes of June 22, 2017 and September 28, 2017.

Motion was made by Dr. Ty Handy to approve both sets of minutes and seconded by Steve Cunanan. Motion carried.

**Special Recognition and Thank You to Mark Ballard – Tom Quick, Michael Gritton**

Mark Ballard is leaving the Board to do other things. Tom recognized and thanked Mark for his leadership and contributions. Michael talked about Mark being an awesome Board member and thanked him for his contribution. While at Sabert Corporation, Mr. Ballard was actively involved with the Kentucky Manufacturing Career Center and in hiring individuals from the center.

Michael informed the Board there are other members transitioning. Steve Willinghurst and Danny DeSpain have both resigned. Danette Rhoads left ComputerShare for a position with a snack food company in southern Indiana and also resigned.

**Nomination of Officers (voted needed) – Mary Ellen Wiederwohl**

In trying to do succession planning, Mary Ellen Wiederwohl nominated Tom Quick to be the immediate past chair and Tony Georges to be the new Board Chair. Tony Georges will begin chairing meetings in January.

Motion was made by Derek Bland to approve the nominations and seconded by Dana Crittendon. Motion carried.

Mary Ellen mentioned the need to have someone chair the Program Oversight Committee.

**Presentation of 2017 Audit Report – Jennifer French, Strothman & Company**

Ms. French, principal at Strothman & Company reviewed KentuckianaWorks 2017 Audit Report. She stated the audit went well and she highlighted that their review produced a “clean opinion.”

There were no questions on the audit report. Mr. Gritton thanked Ms. French for the report.

**Review and Approve Consent Agenda – Cindy Read**

Ms. Read began by speaking about the snapshot report of KentuckianaWorks program highlights and areas of concern. She reassured the Board that staff works closely with all the contractors on all programs on a month-to-month basis on performance.

The consent agenda had two items because the Program Oversight Committee did not have a quorum at the last meeting. The Targeted Occupation list was revised with the addition of Medical Assistants. Occupations are added to the list based on the request of an employer.

The contract for the SummerWorks program held by YouthBuild Louisville operates from October 1st to September 30<sup>th</sup> on a different calendar than other KentuckianaWorks contracts. Although the committee didn't have a quorum, there were members present to review the data and hear a report on last year's SummerWorks program. The program had a successful year, and has met and exceeded all their goals for the year. A vote was taken without a quorum to renew the contract. The contract was renewed because of the start date of October 1<sup>st</sup> so there would be no disruption in services. The members wanted to bring the item back to the Board for a vote. The SummerWorks program took an unexpected cut of \$135,000 from the Louisville Metro Council for this fiscal year, so the YouthBuild contract was reduced accordingly. Aggressive fundraising is being done for the program with the anticipation of raising additional funds. In receiving additional funds for the contract, staff will come back to the Board with additions to the contract.

Ms. Wiederwohl gave clarification on Louisville Metro Council's cut regarding the SummerWorks budget (the Mayor's budget had recommended level funding). With staff and members of the Board talking with Metro Council about the program, it will hopefully bring in more money in the future.

Michael spoke about the event hosted by Paul and Vicki Diaz at their home. He thanked the Diaz family and those who came.

Steve Cunanan asked about the Targeted Occupation list. He asked how the numbers relate to the number of job creations for the next 10 years. Are these the highest need jobs? Cindy responded this is another factor and staff looks at projections of a net of 200 additional new jobs as a threshold.

Motion was made by Steve Cunanan to approve both agenda items and seconded by Dana Crittendon. Motion carried.

**Program Oversight Committee Recommendation to Extend Contract with Louisville Urban League for Kentuckiana Builds – Cindy Read**

Ms Read noted that this contract was pulled off the consent agenda because previously there were performance concerns with the contract. The committee looked at the program closely in September. Kentuckiana Builds had leadership changes and new strategies with a lot of training. The contractor has an employer construction group advising them with valuable discussions. Dr. Wylette Williams is over the program and is making major improvements.

The Louisville Urban League has moved the program in the right direction and wanted to enter into a new contract starting October 1<sup>st</sup>. The contract services began October 1<sup>st</sup> to continue the services. Staff wanted to bring the contract back to the Board for complete transparency and for a vote. Sadiqa Reynolds said along with moving in the right direction they met their goals. They had a lot of challenges with the start of the program. The program's start date was October but didn't get going until December because of significant issues and the location of the program. The success of the program shows a partnership with KentuckianaWorks. She has met with employers but none of them have stepped up to help with transportation. The Louisville Urban League uses their own dollars to pay for Lyft and Uber transportation to help some of the program's graduates get to work. They are trying to get a contract with TARC Ticket to Ride. They may have to hire someone to do the driving. Transportation is a significant challenge when they have placement of individuals at different employers in various parts of the city.

Mr. Gritton acknowledged the TARC representative, Ferdinand Risco, Assistant Executive Director for Transit Authority of River City, in attendance. TARC agreed that their services are not sufficient but agreed to be here as transportation is workforce development and economic development issue, and they are willing to do whatever they can. Mary Ellen stated this is a multi-million dollar problem to solve and an underfunded transit system. We

have great coverage in the county but the frequency is challenging. Pursuing the creative options and innovative solutions is where we're going to be in the near term. Or we'll continue to have a longer term community conversation about transit.

Motion was made by Dr. Ty Handy to approve the contract renewal for an amount not to exceed \$330,000 for nine months (October 1, 2017–June 30, 2018) and seconded by Tami Hatfield. Motion abstained by Sadiqa Reynolds. Motion carried.

**Program Oversight Committee Recommendation to Extend Contract with Options Unlimited for Project CASE – *Cindy Read***

Ms Read noted that this contract was also pulled off the consent agenda list because of previous performance issues. Project CASE is a federal grant awarded to the state Office for the Blind. KentuckianaWorks was subcontracted to manage the grant. Project CASE is a capacity building grant to improve the outcomes for individuals with disabilities in high demand sectors. The program struggled with outcomes and meeting goals. In looking at the struggles of the program and being slow in meeting outcomes, the program was put on corrective action. The program was put on a 3-month contract to be revisited 3 months later to have the contract extended. Mary Rosenthal, program manager for KentuckianaWorks, spoke with the Office of the Blind and they were in support of the contract staying with Options Unlimited and renewing the contract.

Motion was made by Steve Cunanan to approve the contract renewal for an amount not to exceed \$173,784 for the remainder of the program year and seconded by Dana Crittendon. Motion carried.

**Presentation of New Draft By-Laws (vote needed) – *Michael Gritton***

Mr. Gritton informed the Board that a vote was needed on the new By-Laws. Cindy Read gave a reminder that when the Board was larger in the past, it used to have an Executive Committee that often took action on behalf of the Board in between full Board meetings. But under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) the Board was allowed to shrink to 25 members and since that change, the Board has functioned without an Executive Committee.

Mr. Gritton raised the question of how the Board wanted to handle issues that may need some kind of official action in between regularly scheduled Board meetings. He noted that there is nothing currently in the by-laws that allows for official action in between formal Board meetings. The one question he had for the Board and the need for their advice is should he just keep things the way they are? Meaning as long as he has an informal nod from the Board Chair and the Office of the Chair that it's okay, he can move forward with action and just bring it back to the Board for official approval at the next meeting?

The second challenge is how the Board wants to define participation on committees like the Program Oversight Committee? Right now everything is going fine with our programs and contractors and when it's not we try to alert the Board to make them aware of everything. Currently we have a number of people on the POC who are there as designees or proxies for Board members, and the question is whether the Board is comfortable continuing to allow that practice? He's worried that if something goes wrong programmatically, some Board members could look up and realize we don't have enough Board members (as opposed to proxies) on the POC, then people will say what's up and how did you let that happen? At the same time he is trying to get leaders from employers and other groups to serve as Board members, and asking them to attend two meetings a month in practice is a lot to ask.

The way the by-laws are written now allows the Board Chair to make appointments to that committee and it says the Board Chair can appoint non-Board members as long as a majority of the committee is made up of Board members. If the Board is happy with this it will be kept this way. The by-laws allow representatives to come to Board meetings, so Kent Oyler sent him a note that Deana will represent him at today's meeting. If the Board is comfortable with this it will be kept in the by-laws. The same could be true for the POC. Right now Deana is there as a representative for Kent Oyler. Do we count this as a Board member and are you comfortable with that?

This has worked for us at the staff level because we get people who really get into the weeds of the programs in helping us figure things out. Michael wanted to make sure the Board was comfortable with that and in the way the by-laws would read is: Deana would be thought of as a Board member on the POC because she is representing Kent Oyler. This would count if we're trying to meet the majority of Board members. The same for Kent Suiters, who represented Tom Quick on the POC, and Christy Ralston, who represented Tony Bohn there. This is the structure that's being proposed.

Tony Bohn and Bingham Fellows folks were interested in having at least one member from the Bingham Fellows group on the POC because their project got focused on something that Mary Rosenthal and team already been working on which is a way to have partner organizations refer people into the career centers to try to make sure they are getting placed. This would allow a non-Board member to be appointed to a committee like the POC.

In making sure of two questions, Michael asked the Board: a) if they are comfortable with that so this can move forward, and b) does the Board want him to put something in here that allows either the Office of the Chair or some smaller subset of the Board to take official action in between official Board meetings when needed?

Tom Quick asked the Board if they were comfortable with the language under Article Seven of the Committees for the POC that allows somebody to be there instead of a Board member in their place with the same voting privileges as if they were on the Board. Consensus of the Board was this makes sense. Tom talked about his meetings with Kent Suiters, his representative on the POC, who gave him updates on what was going on which was helpful to him. As long as Board members had somebody they know who is knowledgeable and credible that could speak on their behalf, it works.

Steve Cunanan said it would allow them to maintain the criteria that the majority of the committee are Board members as oversight also.

Tony Georges asked if Board members can make a selection to serve on a committee that might vary from one meeting to the next.

Deana Karem addressed Mr. Georges' question that we wouldn't want Kent Suiters to come once and have Jane Smith come to the next meeting because of the POC programs that come through that committee. It's hard to stay connected to the committee if members do not attend on a regular basis and are not the person engaged. Serving on the POC gave Deana insight into what all the people are doing every day and why they are doing what they do. The POC is a hard-working committee.

Michael stated that the law requires the Chair of that committee be a Board member and he's uncomfortable in having a representative of a Board member. He had Danette Rhoads in place to potentially chair the POC but she left ComputerShare. Tony Bohn was the chair of the POC and became a Board Chair. There were other people talked about chairing the POC for a year and then getting into a rotation. Michael informed the Board they may get a phone call from him about recruiting for the committee.

Tom Quick asked the Board for their thoughts about an executive decision team versus the entire Board making calls to benefit Michael and staff. What does the Board think about this?

Dr. Ty Handy thought it was a great idea but it needs to be codified with language that says: **in between regularly scheduled meetings, the CEO in consultation with the Board Chair is empowered to make decisions regarding the organization and those decisions will be shared with the Board at the next meeting and ratified if necessary.**

Michael approved of Dr. Handy's suggested language. He asked if others were comfortable with that language. Sadiqa Reynolds asked if there's some prohibition against a call-in meeting because she would like to know what sort of decisions are being made. There are some decisions nobody would care and that would be fine but then there would be something someday that might be of concern. Michael stated the challenges of the open meetings

law that doesn't allow meetings by phone. You can't vote electronically but may be able to Skype or phone in to a public meeting such as this but it would be a challenge.

Ms. Reynolds asked if the number could be made public so if anybody wanted to call in they could do so. Would this count? Ms. Wiederwohl said it would require the setup of physical space for people to come and view the meeting on screen. Sadiqa said in that they would have to be able to say what sorts of things that the committee could decide without any input at all from the Board. She liked the idea of the executive committee being made up of the chairs and then also who the POC had and whoever else is appropriate.

Deana Karem asked if the practice could allow the Office of the Chair to take action when needed, but would require them to notify Board members beforehand to ask if any had particular opinions about the decision before it was made. She believes that communication puts out fires and puts everybody on the same page.

Mr. Gritton mentioned the real-world example of the food stamp work being done with the state that may require us to pick how the money is going to flow through a current vendor rather than bidding it out because of the short turn-around time involved (the state has asked us to have the program up and running by January 1<sup>st</sup>). There are at least two options: 1) ResCare model through the career centers and 2) using it through the TANF model using Goodwill as the contractor. Or some combination of both. We could try to schedule a full Board meeting in December if anybody that's interested in the selection – the alternative is to empower the staff, in consultation with the Office of the Chair, to take action in December and bring it back for ratification by this Board at the regularly-scheduled January meeting.

On the staff side we're always leery about how many meetings are scheduled. Dr. Handy stated if we're not careful we're going to bind it so much that they feel like they have to share every item because they might get into trouble. The reality is after the fact when the Board has shared the decision, the experience will teach us what ought to be brought forward or not. It's the Board's duty to respond if an error has been made, or if we feel like this is the kind of thing that should have been decided by the full Board. Dr. Handy didn't think the Board had any indication that there's going to be a problem with this decision regarding the food stamp program. Dr. Handy has that power with his Board. He was surprised KentuckianaWorks doesn't have that power. He was given this power in between the school's meetings. It's not in the by-laws but it's in statute. It's not an uncommon operating procedure.

Ms. Reynolds said the Board could do something simple such as allow the chairs to send an email to everyone letting them know and if no objection is made this is what we have to do and you have an hour to respond.

Steve Cunanan commented about the need to watch the balance. There may be some simple criteria whether it's at the expenditure level or type of decision. If it gets above a certain amount then get the Board involved.

Kristin Wingfeld has seen this work in other organizations where the two things that the Board had to deal with is elect officers, allocate money and everything else could be delegated there.

Ms. Wiederwohl asked if Dr. Handy's recommendation could be used as a guiding principal and that staff come back at the next meeting with a proposal. She asked Mr. Gritton if he felt he needed this authority right away. Mr. Gritton replied that he is trying to finalize the by-laws because the state is holding the Board accountable for getting them finished and ideally the Board would approve the by-laws with the suggested change today. Michael liked Dr. Handy's language and clearly thinks it's in line with our current practice. If we end up having to move quickly we would first talk to Mr. Quick and Mr. Georges about it and then send something out to the Board that says, "this is what we discussed with the Office of the Chair, this is the direction that we're moving in and if anybody has a particular objection try to let Michael know by the next day." If there are strong feelings we'll convene a meeting. The amount that will be spent on the food stamp work is in the order of \$150,000 for 6-8 months. It's not an insubstantial amount. An argument can be made either way. Dr. Handy stated if we don't like the by-laws we voted on today, we can change them at the next meeting in January.

Tom Quick said it's almost like approving the by-laws as they are written now with the recommendation that's not in writing here by Dr. Handy. If you want to approve them today just as they are, Michael will come back to the Board in January with a modest change and change them again in January. This would work for staff.

Dr. Handy stated we need to anticipate that at the last two meetings we barely had a quorum. December is not going to be any better. If we don't empower a decision to be made in our absence we may not be in position to make a decision. We barely got a quorum today. We didn't have one last month. He suggested accepting the proposed changes to the by-laws today that codifies that a decision can be made and then fix it back in January if we don't like it. Let's give it a chance.

Mr. Gritton clarified that the motion will be to use Dr. Handy's language that Michael will codify a draft that the Office of the Chair can be empowered to make official action and let the Board know and give them 24 hours to react. If people are fine with it great, and if not, then the Board will have a meeting. That's what he is hearing. Dr. Handy said this would work fine but don't like the idea of creating a void that we can't act on and creating a problem for us. Many boards do this because everybody wants to have their say. Sometimes you just have to make a decision and move on. You can hash it out later.

Ms. Reynolds motioned to accept the pink sheet amending the By-Laws of the Greater Louisville Workforce Development Board, Inc. plus using Dr. Handy's language as follows: in between regularly scheduled meetings, the CEO in consultation with the Board Chair is empowered to make decisions regarding the organization, and those decisions will be shared with the Board at the next meeting and ratified if necessary. Motion seconded by Dana Crittendon. Motion carried.

#### **Executive Director's Report – Michael Gritton**

Mr. Gritton gave an update on the following on the Medicaid Waiver and Food Stamp Pilot Work. He noted that the staff has been involved in extensive work with our partners at the state in order to take over running the Supplemental Nutrition Assistant Program ("SNAP" or "food stamp") Employment and Training program as of January 1<sup>st</sup>. We have also been very involved, with multiple staff members attending multiple meetings a week in Frankfort, with the state's plans to become the first in the nation to have a Medicaid waiver approved that will require Able Bodied Adults Without Dependents ("ABAWDs") to do something (work, job training or community service) 20 hours a week to remain on Medicaid starting July 1, 2018. He believes there will be a lot of training money to use to train people. The 20 hours a week requirement can be met by participating in job training or education. He hopes to have a number of short-term training pathways available for these participants as of July 1<sup>st</sup>, so that they could complete those training tracks and move directly into in-demand jobs in growing fields like manufacturing, healthcare, logistics or IT. RFPs may be put out for training tracks for community colleges and other vendors to compete for.

He noted that none of the details have been worked out yet on how the SNAP Employment and Training program will be implemented, even though the expectation is that the work will move under KentuckianaWorks' control by January 1<sup>st</sup>. He also noted that even though staff have been very involved in many meetings with our state colleagues, a lot of things seem to be getting decided by state folks without consulting the locals (or worse, ignoring our advice!).

#### **Workforce Education Summit – December 8th**

The invitation to the Summit was sent to all Board members. Staff was looking for a Silver Level sponsor to help KentuckianaWorks cover the full cost of the event. It's much appreciated that UPS has agreed to step up and serve as that Silver Level sponsor – many thanks to Tony Georges and his colleagues at UPS for that! The keynote speaker is coming from Brookings Institution. Anthony Smith who once worked in the Mayor's office and now runs a national nonprofit, Cities United, will also be a keynote speaker at the event.

**Discussion and Dialogue: Does the Board Like the Concept of a “Jobs Mall,” and if so, Where Should it be Located? – Cindy Read, Eric Burnette, Mary Rosenthal**

Eric Burnette introduced the Jobs Mall concept that would be a significant change in operations. We’re at the beginning stage of it and it is coming at the same time as the Medicaid program. We expect to have a lot more people coming through the career centers as we are looking at how we can improve on how we do career centers. He reviewed the outline and map of KentuckianaWorks physical career center locations in Jefferson County. He noted that among these locations, we currently spend \$456,000 annually in rent. At one time there were more physical locations as noted with a yellow X on the map. Previous centers were located in Shelby County, Bullitt County, J-Town, Preston Highway and Riverport.

The thought is to consolidate all (9) centers into (1) center or have a small handful of locations. The money currently being used for rent can potentially be used to save dollars by not having (9) separate leases. Michael noted that at many of the locations there are front desk people, utilities, janitors and security which in some cases is on top of the \$456,000. Data is still being crunched on customers by zip codes to get a clear picture of the existing customer base and the potential Medicaid population coming through. Foot traffic is heavily skewed toward Cedar with Preston once being the second largest location when it was open.

As the process gets started, staff would like feedback from the Board to address any concerns or ideas to be considered. Michael stated staff needs directional advice on having a career center in west Louisville or stay at the NIA Center. With having a seven county board, does a single location belong in downtown, inside the Watterson, or somewhere more suburban like on Bardstown Road by the Snyder or at Blankenbaker so that more of our regional county residents could easily get to it? The only physical location for the six counties is Jefferson County currently. Mobile services are provided in different locations through Ryan Troutman and the ResCare team. Staff is not looking for a vote today but directional advice on having a single center or consolidate as much as possible. Will it need to be downtown or out on the ring somewhere? Would the Board be comfortable if we moved it? This conversation involves TARC. A lot of our customers use public transportation. If moved to a suburban ring it would have to be near public transportation.

Mr. Georges asked if the data showed that the closing of previous sites led customers to come to the remaining centers. Keni Brown responded that when the sites were closed at Shelbyville, Bullitt and Preston there was a spike for the first two months. Now there is a drastic decline. They are making changes they think will drive people into the center. Michael made note that foot traffic is down because the state no longer allow individuals to go in-person to handle unemployment insurance benefit information at the centers. This used to be what drove the foot traffic at Cedar and Preston. Now unemployment insurance is being handled over the phone and on the computer discouraging customers from going to the office.

Eric stated foot traffic is more when the economy is bad and when it is good they don’t go as much. We are now in the 8<sup>th</sup> year of economic recovery where the unemployment rate is low, lots of jobs, open jobs, labor market is tight. Foot traffic will go up again when there’s another recession.

Keni Brown gave information on collective numbers for the people entering the centers 2016 and 2017 and on the drop off.

Mr. Georges asked if a portion of the drop is due to the center being closed or I’m not going. Is there an option to go from 6 facilities to 1 facility or from 6 down to 2 or 3 at the NIA Center or Fern Creek.? One of the ideas is to have an east/southwest center for each of the regions. This topic needs to be thought out and talked about and do the numbers on it.

Steve Cunanan stated that’s a good point. From a fiscal standpoint it makes total sense to go ahead and move to one but the real question is not moving to one but what are the optimal numbers of facilities that we need. This could be 1-2-3 or 15 so this is what the question is.

Sadiqa Reynolds thoughts we should get a list of zip codes actually served. She would like to know who we are serving now and what zip codes are they coming from. She's less interested in foot traffic and more interested in the number of people being served. Are people actually walking through or being served?

Mary Ellen Wiederwohl said this is directionally correct in principal. We need to gather data and keep gathering it because if these changes happen in Frankfort all of the models change dramatically. What should be looked at historically is to see who has been served, and parse out the unemployment insurance part as a lot of the traffic was previously driven by that and it would be a false data point and look at that and then look at what's going to happen with SNAP and Medicaid and really understand where those populations are rightly going to come from so we can make a much more data-driven decision. Ultimately we are going to end up in the Medicaid business and with more rather than less depending on how this rolls out. The discussion is good but premature because of the changes on the horizon and we need better data.

Tony Carriss asked of the (9) physical locations how many of those commitments end December 31<sup>st</sup> or how many extend out where rent will be paid. Mr. Gritton noted that all leases have a 60-day notice to vacate. The leases are typically one-year with renewable terms.

Kristin Wingfield asked if there could be a partnership with the library system to expand services and not pay for rent and costs. This is being done now in some of the regional counties with mobile services at adult locations and libraries or both. It does seem to be working but there's challenges with different physical locations.

Tom Quick added with the concept of the Jobs Mall, with a map of the seven counties, with a number of dollars to be spent with no linkage to history, where would we go? We should think about what makes sense.

Mary Ellen Wiederwohl said it goes further in who we think we're serving but where is our labor market going. Making these projections going out based on the various funding streams, the programmatic commitments we made and the types of labor market debates we're going to be having going forward about where we spend our money. As an example, the NIA Center exists because it's in an area that's 4-5 times the level of unemployment of other parts of our region. So we know there's a population there that needs to be served. What other types of considerations do we need to be looking at?

#### **Wrap up and Next Steps – Tom Quick**

Depending upon what we end up doing and pull together in December, the holiday season is here. He wished everybody a happy Thanksgiving. Enjoy the holidays if we don't get back together and have a happy New Year.

Meeting Adjourned.

#### **Staff**

Michael Gritton  
Almeta Abernathy  
Eric Burnette  
Liz Davis  
Gloria Fuqua  
LaShala Goodwin  
Phil Miller  
Shadea Mitchell  
Huston Monarch  
Jennifer Novak  
Laura Paulen  
Cindy Read  
Mary Rosenthal  
Greg Shockley  
Aleece Smith

#### **Guest**

Jennifer French

#### **Observers**

Marsha Berry  
Michael Bodner  
Keni Brown  
Rebel Chreste  
Deb Giordano  
Joyce Griffith  
Natasha Murray  
Ferdinand Risco  
Ryan Troutman