



## **Work Ready Skills Advisory Committee**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**Nov. 9, 2016**

The second meeting of the Kentucky Work Ready Skills (KWRS) Advisory Committee was held at the Kentucky Education and Workforce Development Cabinet, 300 Sower Blvd., Frankfort, Kentucky. The meeting was videotaped.

Secretary Hal Heiner, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and took roll call. All members were present except for Josh Benton and Mike Bowling. There was a quorum.

### **Commission Members Present**

Kentucky Education and Workforce Development Cabinet Secretary Hal Heiner, Chair  
Brooken Smith, proxy for Kentucky Labor Cabinet Secretary Derrick Ramsey  
Hugh Haydon, Kentucky Workforce Innovation Board (KWIB) Chair  
Kristel Smith, Governor's appointee  
Shad Sletto, Governor's appointee  
Kathy Gornik, Governor's appointee  
Vik Chadha, Governor's appointee  
Bob Mitchell, Kentucky Senate President Robert Stivers' appointee,  
Josh Benton, proxy for Cabinet for Economic Development Acting Secretary Erik Dunnigan, was not present for roll call but did attend the meeting.

Absent: Mike Bowling, Kentucky House of Representatives Speaker Greg Stumbo's appointee.

### **Staff Present**

Andy Hightower, Woody Maglinger, Bridget Papalia, Brett Hurst and Kevin Osborne

### **Action Item – Approval of September 14, 2016 Minutes**

After the Committee reviewed the minutes, Shad Sletto made a motion to approve the minute meetings from Sept. 14, 2016. Kathy Gornik seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### **Discussion of Bylaws**

Bob Mitchell said that he had concerns about Section VIII in the bylaws about giving a notice for sub-committee meetings. EWDC General Counsel Bridget Papalia said that the 24-hour notice of meetings applies to the public. She also said that members would know in advance if a meeting is called. Hugh

Haydon asked that Sec. Heiner let the Committee know who his designees for each sub-committee are and Sec. Heiner agreed to do so.

### **Action Item – Approval of Bylaws**

After discussion on the bylaws concluded, Mr. Mitchell made a motion to approve the written bylaws which includes requested amendments to the draft circulated at the Sept. 14, 2016 meeting. Vik Chadha seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### **Election of Officers and Executive Committee At-large Member**

The Committee next discussed the election of officers.

The election of the vice chair was unnecessary because the bylaws designate that “the vice chair shall be the secretary of Economic Development or its designee.”

Mr. Mitchell nominated Kristel Smith for secretary. Hugh Haydon requested that the nominations stop. Ms. Smith was elected unanimously by vote of the Committee.

Mr. Chadha nominated Mr. Sletto for the at-large member of the Executive Committee but he declined. Ms. Smith nominated Mr. Mitchell but he declined. Mr. Haydon nominated Ms. Gornik and she accepted. Ms. Gornik was elected unanimously by vote of the Committee.

### **Other Administrative Matters**

Sec. Heiner began by discussing the difficulty of reviewing the applications. Ms. Gornik and Mr. Haydon agreed that the process is difficult. Mr. Haydon suggested an increase in the staff review. Sec. Heiner agreed that additional staff review would be helpful and productive. However, Sec. Heiner stressed the importance and necessity that all decisions are made by the Committee. He assured that the Committee would make all decisions even with increased staff review.

Sec. Heiner discussed the possibility of hiring a staff person for KWRSI. He said that it would take some of the KWRSI funds but that it would be helpful and necessary. Ms. Gornik agreed that it would be worthwhile to look for a staff person and Mr. Chadha and Mr. Haydon agreed.

Sec. Heiner said they are thinking of bringing in one or two staff persons to review the applications. Mr. Mitchell said he thought Finance and Administration was looking over the process but Sec. Heiner informed him that the process was internal within the Education and Workforce Development Cabinet.

Mr. Haydon discussed his personal experience with staff review and stated it would be helpful. Mr. Mitchell said he thought it would be negligent not to hire a staff person. Brooken Smith asked who the outside staff would report to and Sec. Heiner said it would probably be the executive committee.

Mr. Smith brought up two tasks to consider regarding the potential hiring of a staff person – 1) front end project management and review and 2) construction oversight.

Mr. Sletto brought up the idea of an application audit. He thought that an accounting firm would have the ability to do it.

Sec. Heiner stated his anticipation that the first award would happen by Christmas. He stated that it was important the Committee be careful and avoids moving too quickly in awarding the funds.

Mr. Sletto thought they needed a better understanding of the applications and projects. He thought it was hard to tell exactly where the funding will go based solely on the applications he reviewed. Ms. Smith agreed.

### **Discussion of Pre-applications for Scriyb and Shelby County Projects**

Sec. Heiner explained that three (3) Pre-applications were not reviewed at the previous meeting for various reasons. He explained that it was necessary to enter into closed session to discuss those Pre-applications just as the Committee did during the previous meeting to discuss the other Pre-applications.

#### **Action Item – Enter into Closed Session**

At 9:40 a.m., Ms. Gornik made the motion to go into closed session to discuss the pre-applications pursuant to KRS 61.850 (1) (g). The motion was seconded by Ms. Smith and passed unanimously.

#### **Closed Session (9:40-10:32)**

Note: Josh Benton came to the meeting during the closed session.

#### **Action Item – Exit Closed Session and Enter Open Session**

At 10:32 a.m. Ms. Gornik made the motion to go back into open session. It was seconded by Ms. Smith and approved unanimously.

#### **Action Item**

After reentering open session, Mr. Chadha made a motion to invite applicant #1600118, Shelby County Schools, to submit a full application. Ms. Gornik seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously. This applicant will be granted the same amount of time to submit its full applications as those applicants that submitted a full application previously.

Sec. Heiner announced that the two other applicants, Scriyb (#16010072) and a second Shelby County application (#16010117), were not invited to submit full applications for this round of funding but were invited to reapply for the next round of funding in January.

*The Committee took a break from 10:34 – 10:50 a.m.*

### **Finalizing of Scoring Criteria**

Sec. Heiner suggested of establishing the scoring matrix as a screening tool that may or may not be perfect. He believed the matrix is a good tool to identify better applications, but did not believe that it was necessarily the best way to identify the best applications. The Committee then briefly discussed the idea of greater staff involvement and the need to establish criteria to inform staff what the Committee is looking for in successful applications.

Mr. Mitchell responded to Sec. Heiner's suggestion that the matrix be a screening tool by noting that he believes the Committee will face criticism if they set up a matrix and don't use it. Mr. Sletto said he thinks the matrix is a guide more than an absolute and he likes subjective input. Mr. Mitchell said the matrix needs to be there to show concrete reason for why an application won. Mr. Haydon agreed with Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Mitchell explained his experience with awarding projects during his time serving on the PRIDE board. He said the Corps of Engineers forced them to adhere to a set matrix to avoid criticism. He said everything they did went through an Inspector General (IG) investigation and was closely monitored. He said this led to many applications being approved when the actual implementation was not feasible. The IG made sure the awards and applicants followed requirements. Mr. Mitchell said the close monitoring and definite matrix helped the PRIDE board avoid scrutiny.

Mr. Haydon said he likes the matrix idea and sticking to it. He said he thinks it allows for some subjective and objective input. He brought up the possibility of scoring the applications more than once.

Mr. Sletto said he does not think the matrix weighs the aspects appropriately. He wanted to look into the weight and brought up the possibility of taken an average number for categories rather than black and white.

Sec. Heiner said he thought they should use the matrix to get the number of applications down to a smaller number, around half.

Ms. Gornik said that she has not served on many public money boards but she has used discretion in private business. She wanted to know if the scoring matrix is a guideline or the mandatory way to score. She said she is uncomfortable with being married to the scoring matrix and thinks the Committee should review the projects with the idea that "whole is greater than the sum of the parts" in order to give proper credit to projects that may not be the highest-scoring based purely on the matrix.

Mr. Benton said that Economic Development has always used a scoring matrix and that it eliminates many applications. He said a matrix needs to clearly demonstrate the values of the program and the basis for a decision. He said that auditors strongly recommend a scoring matrix for final decisions.

Mr. Sletto said the matrix can include individual factors.

Mr. Mitchell stressed the importance of following the Governor's Executive Order and stated the possibility that the Committee would be audited following the awarding of funds.

Mr. Sletto said he would not give the Executive Order items more weight than the factors that the Committee has added. He wants dual credit and the number of job created to carry weight.

Ms. Smith said the goal is job creation and choosing projects that meet the mission.

Sec. Heiner asked Ms. Papalia what the Committee can do to score. She said that it must meet the technical requirements of the Executive Order but the Committee has great discretion to set the requirements and process for application reviews. Andy Hightower read the pertinent sections from the Executive Order.

Sec. Heiner said each applicant was given instructions and the Executive Order and knew that the Committee had the authority and discretion to add additional criteria into the matrix.

Mr. Chadha asked about the spirit of the program and about business retention and business attraction. Ms. Benton believes both of these items are addressed by the application and matrix. He referred to the scoring matrix and said that #1 addresses business expansion and #3 addresses growth.

Mr. Chadha raised concerns about the number of people trained versus jobs available in a region. He asked what if 500 people are trained but there are only 100 jobs in the region.

Mr. Mitchell said the goal is to have the Committee make calls equally and in good faith.

Mr. Chadha said he is concerned about training a lot of people but not having jobs for them. He said there is no guarantee that companies will come here or there jobs will come here. He wants to fully understand the market for these jobs for which people are being trained. He believed it was risky to train people in certain sectors based on a belief that employers in those sectors would come to Kentucky in the future. He wants to balance that risk by ensuring Kentuckians receive training in the sectors relevant to the open jobs as well as others.

Sec. Heiner said one of his great concerns is that Kentucky does not have a trained workforce. We have job openings now that are not being filled and that will hurt the state. He said he have to prepare young people for work as well as train the future workforce.

The Committee discussed the specifics of the Scoring Matrix. Mr. Chadha said he is concerned about getting the most bang for the buck with the funds. Sec. Heiner said that numbers 3, 4 and 8 in the matrix address this issue.

Mr. Haydon said he wants to see sustainability achieved and wants to update number 8.

Mr. Benton wants to update #6. Mr. Sletto wants to strike "students" from the language. Mr. Haydon wants to add something about the impact on those not in the workforce now. Ms. Smith wants to add the labor participation rate.

Sec. Heiner said if the Committee leaves #6 in the matrix the way it is now, what new item would they add.

Mr. Haydon said that they are trying to grow the workforce not train people to fill a specific job for Company A.

After discussion, Sec. Heiner suggested that the Committee add the following item to the matrix as section 7: "program to market and involve high school students and adults not currently employed or underemployed." They discussed adding engagement as a new section in the Scoring Matrix.

Mr. Chadha said he noticed there are a lot of yes or no questions in the Scoring Matrix and he thinks they should add examples to it. Mr. Benton agreed. He said they need something to differentiate applications. The yes or no questions do not permit that.

The Committee discussed how to score participation, innovative training and postsecondary credit.

Sec. Heiner and Mr. Mitchell discussed allowing secondary groups to utilize facilities if necessary.

The committee discussed project radius and how to weigh that.

Sec. Heiner said the Scoring Matrix will be revised during lunch according to their discussions. He also stated that the Committee would discuss the weight of each item after lunch and that every committee

member can rate the 12 items on the scoring sheet in terms of the value. They will review it after lunch as a group.

*The Committee broke for lunch from 12:09 – 12:53 p.m.*

### **Continuation of Discussion of Finalizing of Scoring Criteria**

The Committee continued the discussion about the scoring items following the lunch break. Sec. Heiner suggested that Item 8 on the matrix be amended to include the phrase “postsecondary credit.” Ms. Smith pointed out that this addition is redundant because of #12. Mr. Sletto agreed and the Committee decided not to change it.

The Committee then discussed the appropriate weighting of the items included on the scoring matrix. Each member reviewed the score sheet independently and wrote his/her opinion of weight distribution. Mr. Hightower compiled the Committee-member’s individual weights to reach the group number.

The Committee discussed the possibility of scoring the full applications twice.

Sec. Heiner suggested leaving scores in place and picking the top half based on the initial score on the scoring matrix. The top half, if that’s the number the Committee decided to send through, would have a site visit, interview or both. Sec. Heiner suggested adding an additional twenty (20) points based on the result of the interview or site visit. This would be added to the initial score to reach the final value.

Mr. Sletto believed that Sec. Heiner’s suggestion would be too much work. Mr. Haydon said it seemed like a difficult way to reconcile the scores but recognized the need to differentiate the applications. Mr. Haydon went on to suggest that there needed to be a way to determine the number of people impacted relative to the cost.

Mr. Benton stated that it is difficult to understand the logistics of a project without more information than is provided in the applications.

Ms. Smith asked Sec. Heiner who would be conducting the site visits for those projects that needed one. Sec. Heiner thought it would be prudent to send a staff person to do the visits. Mr. Mitchell agreed and he stated that if they get down to three to four projects, they could then visit each one. Sec. Heiner said he envisions 15 or more projects that would make it through.

Mr. Mitchell said once they decide how much money to spend on this round, it will be possible to see how many projects are feasible.

Mr. Haydon voiced a “small” concern with the site visits because he does not believe a visit is necessary for each project. For example, if a project features only the purchase of equipment it is unnecessary go visit. They could send a picture of the item in that circumstance. He said they need to come up with some equation to determine impact.

Mr. Sletto said he is in favor of completely rescoring the matrix based on the site visits. He believes this will ensure the matrix is used, but allow additional review and proportional adjustment.

Mr. Haydon thinks they can use the matrix to get down to 20 or so projects then use the matrix and rate them 1-20 again. Mr. Chadha said that he is concerned that it would be a lot of work for the Committee.

Mr. Chadha brought up that he would like to see a way to reflect the salary that the jobs will offer as part of the scoring. Mr. Benton does not believe this is feasible or logical because high school students would not make as much as a trained experienced adult.

Mr. Sletto reiterated his belief that rescoring using the same matrix is the best way to proceed.

Mr. Mitchell does not believe ranking them 1 – 20 does not demonstrate each board member’s input. He thinks they should get to a certain number of applicants and do site visits or interviews and each member gets 20 additional points to score based on that visit and/or interview. Mr. Benton thought that idea had merit if they agree on certain factors to look for in their review.

Mr. Benton voiced concern about Mr. Sletto’s idea because it will lead to difficulty in ranking the projects again and reconciling their differences. Mr. Mitchell said he thinks the Committee will be surprised by how similar their individual reviews will be.

After hearing the input of the Committee, Sec. Heiner suggested the following plan:

1. the Committee reduces the number of applications by half using staff review and scoring;
2. they have a staff member visit the site to confirm scoring;
3. they do not do interviews for smaller projects;
4. they talk to individuals proposing larger projects;
5. each staff member rates the remaining projects on a 20-point scale, high and low thrown out and the average of the remaining calculated and added to the previous matrix score, after the interview and if the average of the combined scores is not sufficient, the project is out.

The Committee would have to determine the cutoff point for small versus large projects.

Ms. Smith said in comparing small versus large projects, they would need to look at the impact of the project and do a cost-benefit analysis. She thought the scoring matrix would allow the committee to understand the process and identify good projects and she liked Sec. Heiner four-star idea. She thought it would be burdensome to completely rescore the 12 review standards in the matrix. She thought doing interviews would allow them to get information and details that ensure proper assessment and understanding of the projects.

Mr. Mitchell proposed that the Committee approve the amount of money they will spend and the number of projects the staff will present to the committee. Sec. Heiner said the scoring matrix would be a tool to determine which applicants get an interview and which get a site visit.

### **Action Item – Approval of Scoring Matrix as Screening Tool**

Ms. Gornik made a motion to approve the scoring matrix, as discussed, to serve as a screening tool to determine which applicants get an interview and/or site visit. Mr. Chadha seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### **Action Item – Approval of Maximum Funding Awarded for First Round**

The Committee discussed the amount of funding to approve for the first round of applications. They discussed awarding a maximum of approximately two-thirds, \$65 million, of the \$100 million in the first round.

Ms. Smith made the motion to award up to \$65 million of the \$100 million in the KWRSI program in the first round. Mr. Chadha seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

### **Action Item – Approval of Partial Awards to Projects**

The Committee discussed making partial awards for applications. Sec. Heiner stated he encountered some projects that have two aspects, one of which is excellent and one of which is not as excellent. Sec. Heiner believes that the potential of partial awards would be a good idea in those cases. Mr. Haydon agreed with Sec. Heiner and stated that partial awards are an excellent idea. Mr. Haydon voiced his belief that the Committee has an obligation to stretch the money as far as possible. Kathy and Vik agreed.

Ms. Gornik made a motion to allow partial awards to applicants. Ms. Smith seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

### **Discussion of Partnership Match Percentage**

The Committee discussed the partner match in the applications. He said that in early discussions about partner match they considered 25 percent but the governor thought that was too high so they set it at 10 percent. Sec. Heiner said he thinks the amount should go up beyond 10% in areas that are not hurting economically or have other resources available.

*The Committee took a break from 1:56 – 2:11 p.m.*

### **Discussion of Weighting of Scoring Matrix Criteria**

Sec. Heiner introduced the discussion of weighting the scoring criteria in the matrix. They reviewed the last scoring matrix. Sec. Heiner thought that numbers 1, 4 and 9 are underweighted and thought the job openings should weigh more than on-the-job (OTJ) training. He thought numbers 6 and 7 were important but the weight should be reduced.

Mr. Sletto thought the average was perfect.

Mr. Benton thought #6 is critical.

Ms. Gornik liked Sec. Heiner's suggestions and thought #1 is most important but Mr. Sletto disagreed.

Mr. Benton thought numbers 6 and 8 were as important as #1. Kathy pointed out that number 5 was as important and Benton agreed.

Mr. Sletto said that the original weight perfectly balances the need and training provided. Mr. Chadha, Mr. Gornik and Ms. Smith disagreed because each item is independently-reviewable and the connection Mr. Sletto was making is implicit.



Mr. Haydon asked whether or not the 50-mile radius identified in #1 had to be in Kentucky. He also brought up #3 and said that rural areas are at disadvantage on this criterion because there are not as many jobs available in these areas.

Mr. Chadha was concerned about the demand for jobs in the area and felt that this was a huge factor that should play a large role in any decision. Mr. Chadha pointed out that jobs already in place are much less risky than taking a bet that a job will be there in “X” years if we train the workforce.

Ms. Gornik said the KWRSI Committee was put together to connect people to jobs. Mr. Benton addressed Mr. Chadha’s and Ms. Gornik’s statements about jobs in place in a region versus perspective opportunities by stating that the need for training in specific sectors is largely universal across the entire state of Kentucky. For that reason he does not want to reduce the weight of #3 any further.

Ms. Gornik said she believes that providing workforce training in sectors that are not in-demand in an area is a negative. Ms. Smith pointed out the private employer partner as an example that it is not really a “build it and they will come” scenario because these are existing companies that are ready to participate. Mr. Benton agreed but said that is not really the situation because the sectors are needed across Kentucky. Ms. Smith points out that the presence of the private employer partners shows this is not an “if you build it they will come” scenario. Mr. Benton agrees but reemphasizes that workforce sectors needs are universal across the state.

After hearing discussion, Sec. Heiner reviewed and broke the scoring matrix into four (4) primary categories:

1. Employee need – 16 percent
2. Quality of program – 38 percent
3. Efficiency of state money use – 22 percent
4. Employer needs – 24 percent

Mr. Mitchell finished the discussion by stating that he can live with whatever goes in the Scoring Matrix because he knows the Committee will pick the right people after the interviews and visits.

### **Action Item – Approval of Scoring Matrix**

Mr. Haydon made a motion to approve the Scoring Matrix. Ms. Gornik seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. A copy of the final Scoring Matrix is attached to the minutes.

### **Discussion on Additional Items**

The Committee then discussed the scoring matrix and the individual considerations staff should keep in mind while reviewing the applications for each category. Staff is asked to score each item on a 1-5 scale.

Regarding Item #1 - Sec. Heiner and Mr. Benton stated that staff should review only data within the five (5) KWIB sectors. Mr. Haydon pointed out that the interviews will be helpful in learning more about this category.

Regarding #2 – The Committee noted that this item is straightforward and did not have lengthy discussion.

Regarding #3 – The Committee discussed the importance to balance this item to ensure that rural areas with less population were not disadvantaged because of the larger populations for some project areas.

The Committee discussed equally valuing the total number of unemployed individuals and the percentage of the population within the 30-mile radius that is unemployed.

Regarding Item #4 - Mr. Chadha stated his preference for cash donations as opposed to in-kind donations when looking at this category. Mr. Benton said in-kind donations such as buildings are good. Sec. Heiner stated that he did not think operational expenses were an acceptable matching contribution. He believes cash, facilities and equipment are the only acceptable forms of matching. Mr. Haydon noted that sustainability is important and that he believed operational costs fell within his definition of sustainability. Sec. Heiner requested that each staff reviewer specifically include private partner cash contribution and public partner cash contribution in their review. Sec. Heiner also pointed out that applicants who failed to hit the timeline requirements set forth in the application will lose funding. The money will revert back to the fund in the event this occurs.

Regarding #5 – Mr. Benton said he would like to see letters from employers. Mr. Hightower pointed out that some applications included detailed letters while others sent form letters. Mr. Benton voiced a preference for more specific letters. Mr. Benton also believed it would be a good idea to have private partners attend the interviews, in-person or by phone, with the lead applicant. Ms. Gornik agreed with this.

Sec. Heiner mentioned some criteria for 1-5 star ratings. A 1 star would simply identify the need for jobs. A 5 star would include large or multiple employers saying they have jobs available.

Regarding #6 – The Committee discussed some criteria for staff to consider in reviewing this category. Sec. Heiner pointed out that a program like KY FAME would be a 5 star.

Regarding #7 – Mr. Sletto is looking for engagement in this category. Engagement is marketing or participation. Mr. Haydon is looking for outreach in this category. The Committee gave guidance on the criteria for 1-5 stars. A 1 star plan merely has a marketing plan. A 3 star plan has the plan and also is well thought out and identifies target groups. A 5 star has a plan, identifies groups and has begun engaging those groups.

Regarding #8 – Brooken Smith brought up certified apprenticeships through the Labor Cabinet as a good piece to look for in this item. The Committee discussed the following criteria for a 1-5 star. A 1 star is a project that demonstrates the applicant considered open jobs as part of project. A 3 star project is one in which participants obtain a license or credential. A 5 star project would be one in which the employers and the trainings align. Sec. Heiner noted, and the Committee agreed, that this category and the WRSI Initiative in general, is interested in licenses and certifications for Kentucky workers. It is not focused on the number of Master, Bachelor or Associate Degrees offered by a project.

Regarding #9 – Sec. Heiner recommended that staff review this category by setting up a range to determine which projects were most efficient.

Regarding #10 – Mr. Sletto said we should look at graduation and completion rates. Mr. Haydon voiced his belief that a budget would be helpful. Mr. Sletto said he would give the highest rating to those with good placement. The Committee decided to allocate points for this category as follows: Experience = 1 point; Placement = 2 Points Total; Graduation Rate/Completion = 2 Points Total.

Regarding #11 – Mr. Benton believes that competency-based learning is a large consideration for this item. Ms. Smith talked about the value she places on the hands-on training she had through internships/apprenticeships. She believed this hands-on training is a great way to learn. Sec. Heiner

and others agreed that the opportunity for participants to complete accelerated paths and leverage technology should be considerations for this item. The Committee offered the following guidance on scoring 1-5. An unresponsive application gets 0. An application that does something is a 3. A project which utilizes innovative techniques well gets a 5.

Regarding #12 – The Committee agreed to remove the word “every” from the draft. (Note: It is removed from the final draft attached). The Committee said 0 should be awarded to an unresponsive application. Three points should be awarded to an application offering dual credit in 1 sector. Five points should be awarded to an application which offers dual credit in 2 or more sectors.

Sec. Heiner encouraged reviewing staff to utilize the notes section of the scoring matrix.

The Committee then revisited the 50-mile radius in Item #1 and noted that the geographic line can cross state borders but the number of people trained should include only Kentucky residents.

Mr. Sletto mentioned that he would also like to review the applications against the matrix. Mr. Haydon is fine with Mr. Sletto reviewing but definitely wants to ensure staff completes scoring and reports to the Committee.

### **NEXT MEETING**

The Committee’s next meeting is scheduled for Nov. 18, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. The Committee plans to determine which applications move on and get interviews/visits at this meeting after reviewing the staff scoring.

The Committee scheduled a meeting on December 14-15, 2016. Those applicants invited for interviews will attend this meeting and answer the Committee’s questions.

Ms. Gornik stated that she would like to accompany staff on site visits. Ms. Papalia pointed out that it would be necessary ensure compliance with Kentucky Open Meetings law if members wished to attend. The possibility of publishing the dates of visits was discussed. Sec. Heiner said he will publish the travel schedule and Committee members are welcome to visit.

### **Action Item**

Because the Committee did not review full applications during this meeting, some of the items on the agenda were unnecessary. Ms. Gornik made a Motion to Strike the following agenda items, and Mr. Chadha seconded it:

First Round Review of Applications, Second Round Review of Applications, Continue Second Round Review of Applications, Identify those Projects that will be invited for interviews.

The Motion passed unanimously.

### **Action Item**

Mr. Haydon made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Gornik seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:55 p.m.