

Social Services & Community Development Committee  
March 19, 2013 Summary & Motions

Ford called the meeting to order at 11:02 AM. All Committee members were present except Lawless and Lane. Clarke and Henson were also present.

*1.22.13 Committee Summary*

On a motion by Ellinger, second Beard, the summary of the 1.22.13 Social Services & Community Development Committee was approved unanimously.

*Workforce Development & Training*

Ford called on Darryl Smith, Chair of the Bluegrass Workforce Investment Board (BGWIB). Mr. Smith described the services of the BGWIB. Smith also described the Workforce investment Board and its purpose and services offered. He also discussed the federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1988 which created and funded the services the BGWIB undertakes.

Smith discussed the inter-local agreement entered into by the other sixteen (16) counties within the seventeen(17)- county BGWIB. He noted that Lexington chose not to sign the agreement. He stated that the agreement is governed by the WIA which would not allow the previous provision that granted set aside funds for Lexington-Fayette County.

Myers discussed the expectations that are set for training. In response Jennifer Compton stated that the WIB has a list of approved training that is offered, but before they subsidize the training it needs to address high demand employment.

Myers discussed a situation where Sears contacted several local organizations seeking trained staff and training opportunities. In response Compton stated that the BGWIB has identified four sectors where they want to concentrate their resources. She went to say, however, that the BGWIB will work with any current employer who has a true employment training need.

Akers asked if the BGWIB will work with the non-profit community to fill their employment training needs.

In response Smith stated that the BGWIB is starting to make connections with the non-profit community.

Kay asked about the agreement and asked what Lexington would be committing to? In response Compton stated that there was not a funding commitment just a partnership and an agreement to work together.

Kay asked that the Administration come back with a recommendation to sign or not sign the agreement. He asked that the Administration identify any concerns they have about signing the agreement.

Stinnett asked that the Administration come to the next meeting to discuss any concerns about the agreement and with a recommendation to proceed with signing the agreement.

In response CAO Sally Hamilton stated that she will be prepared to address the inter-local agreement at the next meeting.

Stinnett asked if training was done in house. In response Compton stated that much of the training is coordinated through 3<sup>rd</sup> parties, but in the case of Amteck, Amteck provided the training, which included a -two week boot camp, recruitment and drug screening, all of which take place in house.

Stinnett asked if they partner with the service sector. In response Smith stated that they partner with the service sector. He noted that BCTC works with employers on work ethic issues and other areas of the service sector.

Stinnett asked that Compton provide her contact information, which is 859.269.8021 and her e-mail is [jcompton@bgadd.org](mailto:jcompton@bgadd.org).

Ellinger asked about corrective actions associated with the Sears issue. In response Smith stated that the WIB learned a lot about customer feedback because of the issue with Sears. He stated that the issue forced the BGWIB to improve its communications with area employers.

Ford asked about accountability and responsiveness and building a partnership.

In response Smith stated that both parties need to do a better job of communicating in an open forum.

Ford discussed improving the relationship between Lexington and the BGWIB.

In response Smith focused on the opportunity to forge a new relationship with Lexington.

Myers asked about the cost of training. In response Compton stated that most WIBs across the Commonwealth do not include on the job training costs which increases the cost of training. She stated that the BGWIB utilizes on the job training extensively because of its positive impact.

Myers asked that the issue not be delayed. He stated that the parameters had changed and Law or the CAO should explain why Lexington should or should not sign the agreement.

*FY 14 Partner Agency Review* Ford called on Beth Mills to discuss the Partner Agency FY 14 Budget Review process. Ford stated that there would not be any action taken today, that the presentation was for information only. He stated that last year Council wanted to see the funding level recommendation earlier.

Mills stated that the Administration had increased its recommended partner agency funding by \$ 250,000 from the FY 13. She stated that the review is a competitive process and the process was carried out by independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party reviewers including representatives of the Council.

Craig Benz discussed the partner agency process. He discussed the timeline, the application requirements, and also summarized the applications received. He discussed the scoring committee and review panels. He also discussed the funding recommendations for the 55 program applications.

Ford called on CAO Hamilton. Hamilton stated that she and Mayor Gray had had several conversations about the process. She stated that the Mayor felt that the process should be reviewed, but more importantly, did not think critical services should be affected because of the process. She said that the Mayor felt that the process should reflect the priorities of food and shelter.

Ellinger stated that the Hamilton addressed many of his concerns. He stated that the point reduction was much too severe. He asked who made the decision to deduct 20 points from any application that was late. He also stated that there appeared to be a discrepancy in when applications were received.

In response Mills stated that the process provided for the rejection of late applications. She said it was the Administration's position to accept and rank the application but deduct up to 20 points. She said that five applications received 20 point reductions because they were not completely turned in on time.

Stinnett stated that until several years ago, the partner agencies received up to \$ 5 million and now the funding level is approximately \$ 2 million. He stated that the agencies provide critical services for the community. He stated that a review of the process is warranted but he wanted to maintain the integrity of the process.

Kay stated that the process allowed Lexington to fund programs not agencies. He noted that it was still the Council's responsibility to evaluate the merits of partner agency requests and that the Administration would just make recommendations to the Council.

Kay asked a question about the scoring component. In response Benz stated that there was a 140 point scale. 10 pts for completeness; 5 pts for mission statement; 60 pts for program/approach; 30 pts for measures/outcomes; 20 pts for budget; and 15 pts for diversity of budget.

Kay stated that the point was weighted and that once the needs assessment was completed the point system would reflect those identified needs in the future.

Ford discussed the process. He stated that Council requested the process and that it was an objective process.

Beard suggested that in addition to the direct allocation to partner agencies, the budget included a discretionary amount of funds set aside for critical unmet needs.

Kay asked about the 20 pts for funding diversity. In response Benz stated that that was included to ensure that any agency did not become solely dependant on the Urban County Government.

Ellinger stated that the process as implemented was flawed and that the 20 pt reduction for being apparently late was unwarranted. He provided examples of funding recommendations if other agencies were late with their respective budget requests.

Henson addressed the upcoming needs assessment and spoke in support of the objective process and spoke for support for critical services.

Lindy Carrs, with the Salvation Army, spoke about the application process. She stated that the Salvation Army was gratified by the community support for the Salvation Army.

She discussed the services that the organization provides and the impact the loss of \$ 250,000 would have on their service level. She stated that the Salvation Army submitted their application by the deadline, but that one spreadsheet was inadvertently lost during the electronic submittal.

Jack Burch spoke in favor of maintaining the objective process. He also provided some historical perspective on how the requests were handled before the process was implemented.

Myers spoke about the need to maintain objective analytics in the process.

Ford thanked everyone for their participation. He stated that there would not be time to adequately address the 3<sup>rd</sup> item on the agenda, "Adult & Tenant Services". He asked that the item be included on the next agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:57 PM.