

MINUTES OF THE C-WIB PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 26, 2012

In the absence of Committee Chair Betty Jo Brooks, Jim Dickerson called the Planning Committee to order at 10:55 a.m.

Committee members present were Collin Brink, Jim Dickerson, T.R. Dudley, Harold Haldiman, Mary Hughes, Joyce Jones, Vicki Nelson, Rick Robertson, and John Vaughn.

C-WIB members in attendance were Bill Debo, Sarah Gallagher, Sharon Gibson, Earl Horsefield, W.D. Hunter, Patrick Kelly, Janet Kinnett, David Miller, Nancy Montgomery, Doug Piant, and Tina Sooter.

C-WIB staff in attendance included Executive Director Jan Vaughn, Alex Blackwell, Alan Galindo, Linda Gray, and Jacque Moreland.

Other attendees included Joyce Davis of Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), Trish Rogers of Central Ozarks Private Industry Council (COPIC), Paula Curtman of Lake of the Ozarks Employment Services (LOES), and Wayne Hakes and Stacie Gurin of the Department of Labor.

Minutes

Jim D. read the names of the people who were voting on the Planning Committee today. They are Collin Brink, T.R. Dudley, Harold Haldiman, Mary Hughes, Joyce Jones, Vicki Nelson, Rick Robertson, and John Vaughn.

Jim D. asked if there was a motion on the July 2012 minutes? Mary Hughes made a motion to approve the July 2012 minutes, and Collin Brink seconded; the Planning Committee approved the minutes as written.

RFP's / NGCC

Jim D. stated the evaluation committee met. The state wanted to review the RFP's bid process. They say it is connected to the DOL review. Jim D. has talked with them several times and then Jan V. and Jim D. both received an email from them late yesterday with questions about the process, which we have not had a chance to address that at this point in time.

The state has asked us to extend the current contractors contracts for thirty days with an option of thirty more days, and that is coming out of Julie Gibson's office in order to keep the programming going while they are doing their review.

Jim D. stated we will be bringing those bids to you all and the recommendations as soon as the state approves the process and everything. They don't want us to do anything until they finish their review. Considering they wanted us to be in operation with whatever contractors was selected by September 1, 2012 is taking quite a while. That is where we are with that process.

On the NGCC report, Jim D. asked the functional managers to give an update on what is occurring at the career centers.

Trish R. reported they continue to work hard in the career center. She notices that their traffic at Rolla is up a bit. We are seeing a few more people come in now asking for training, although our training request numbers are slightly down. Our workshop classes are increasing. We had about 300 that went through the workshops last month. As far as long term training that number is slightly down.

The OJT workshops are going very well. We had 17 in the workshop last week, and our OJT placements are going well. Overall we continue to see a lot of people collecting unemployment benefits, and we are trying to work with those that are long term unemployed with job placement.

Paula C. reported that LOES has hired an OJT coordinator that will start on Monday. They are still busy at the career center.

Joyce D. reported at the Mexico career center they have two DWD people and one of them has been hired as a Veteran's representative. We don't know if they will replace him.

There are two DWD people in Columbia. The person who left in July did all of our classes so we have had to move staff around. We have also hired an OJT coordinator in our area. We had a little difficulty, the first person that we had hired turned it down so we had to reopen the position.

In Jefferson City it has been pretty stable, but have not had any major changes with staff leaving, but they are all busy. We had some temps that were hired through the EUC funds. We put two on in Columbia and one in Jefferson City. We are getting ready to put one on in Mexico.

Jim D. stated addressing your staff issue, you do have a person in place currently that is handling the OJT project, before your new person gets on. On your comments about the staffing in Columbia and Mexico, originally we were told that we could fill the position in Mexico because we were told that we had met that seven staff reduction that they asked us to do last year. Now as late as yesterday, the state is saying they are not going to fill the position at the current time and they are asking us to use our new RES EUC which is people hired through unemployment extension and that is all they are supposed to be working. That really doesn't help too much on the big end of the traffic flow because most of them are not RES people. So we are getting ready to have some pretty stringent discussions with the state regarding the staffing issue.

LWIB Membership Recertification

Jim D. reported Linda G. is the one who has been receiving the nomination forms to board seats. Jim D. asked Linda if she had a rough estimate of that of where we stand right now.

Linda G. reported she has received quite a few nomination forms back. There are a few who still need to get me their nomination forms. I've also started receiving some appointment letters from some of the Caucus. We are working on getting the board vacancies filled.

Jan V. reported we have received one change that involves the FEIN number. We received it and discussed it with the state folks yesterday. All of the private slots will have to get their FEIN number for the state. That will be an adjustment there. Linda will let the private slot people know.

Mary H. asked Jan what the FEIN number is? Jan V. reported it is a tax ID number which is a number the Federal government gives a company that is open for business and hires employees and so forth.

Jim D. stated that also in that same category, as part of our dealings with the state regarding our DOL monitoring and response that pertains to the board membership, the report says that four private sector representatives on the board said to the DOL when they called them that they were retired. That is not allowable. The state has made that clear to me that that is not allowable and made it clear that they will not go along with recertification in those cases.

In saying that, if any of you are in that category you need to talk to me a little bit so we can work through that issue. I have no idea because they haven't told us who all they've talked to, but according to their report that situation is there and it will have to be addressed.

Mary H. stated to Jim that she was concerned about some other things that he mentioned the state had told him that the people who work in private sector must be a power in the management decision making staff of the organization. That's not necessarily going to be right either.

Jim D. stated that's part of the language in the legislation that they want them to be in a hiring/firing policy making situation. We are going to work through that but first we have got to be able to figure things that they are noisier about than retired. Jim stated that completes our agenda do we have a motion to adjourn?

Bill D. stated regarding this tax ID number we have always had trouble getting board members and this is just going to make it harder to get board members. Jim D. stated he agrees.

Collin Brink made a motion to adjourn the committee, there were no objections. The Planning Committee adjourned at 11:07 a.m.

MINUTES OF THE C-WIB OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

September 26, 2012

Committee Chair Earl Horsefield called the Oversight Committee to order at 11:08 a.m.

Committee members present were Earl Brown, Jim Dickerson, Sarah Gallagher, W.D. Hunter, Earl Horsefield, Janet Kinnett, Doug Piant, and Tina Sooter.

C-WIB members in attendance were Collin Brink, Bill Debo, T.R. Dudley, Sharon Gibson, Sarah Gallagher, Sharon Gibson, Kathy Groves, Harold Haldiman, Mary Hughes, Joyce Jones, Patrick Kelly, David Miller, Nancy Montgomery, Vicki Nelson, Rick Robertson, and John Vaughn.

C-WIB staff in attendance included Executive Director Jan Vaughn, Alex Blackwell, Alan Galindo, Linda Gray, and Jacque Moreland.

Other attendees included Joyce Davis of Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), Trish Rogers of Central Ozarks Private Industry Council (COPIC), Paula Curtman of Lake of the Ozarks Employment Services (LOES), and Wayne Hakes and Stacie Gurin of the Department of Labor.

Minutes

Jim Dickerson made a motion to approve the July 25, 2012 minutes, and Janet Kinnett seconded; the Oversight Committee approved the minutes as written.

Earl H. asked Doug Piant to introduce himself. Doug Piant is our Cole County representative for labor. Earl stated that Doug is a member of this committee and if you don't have a copy of the committee list please ask Linda for one.

At the April 2012 Board meeting the Board voted and approved to include the statement "The CWIB Board is extremely worried about the work overload of our staff. We are worried about their health and the future of their careers and would like to go on record that the Board is concerned" into the minutes of all future Board meetings. The motion was made by T.R. Dudley to have the statement included into all future Board meeting minutes, and was seconded by Earl Horsefield, the Board approved the motion.

DOL Monitoring & Response

Jim D. reported he has already referenced part of what was in the monitoring. The way that process was worked is the state got a big report which was on the state level and included the Central Region and the Kansas City Region, and then we supposedly received everything that pertains specifically to Central Region.

We have responded to that, and one case, and it happens to be a case that I've already talked about regarding the board membership. The state did ask for additional details and clarification, and that pertained to how we were going to cure that problem that I've already addressed with the retirement issue, how we were going to in the future locate private sector people that met the requirement of the laws and regulations.

Jim D. stated that we have talked with them about that and another issue in that entire category regarding the board which I had addressed with you all and I've addressed this with the caucus twice now was that we had two board seats one of which was in Moniteau County and another of which is in Osage County, those seats had been vacant for two years.

What occurs in those instances is we try to work with the county commissions in filling those board seats. As you all know our by-laws require we have two board seats per county of the nineteen counties. In the case in Moniteau we had a person when we had board reappointments who had agreed to fill that seat. He came to one meeting and then he told the commissioners he didn't want to serve. This is just something he decided he did not want to do. Ever since that time the county commission has been telling me that they cannot find anyone to serve.

In Osage County we had an individual identified who I felt like he would have been a good member, and he backed out before he even came to a meeting. The same thing holds true there that they have not been able to come up with someone to fill that seat.

What I have presented to the commissioners is we can't continue to let board seats remain vacant for that long. Not only can we not allow it but the state after monitoring it will certainly not allow it, and I am sure the DOL is not going to allow it. I told the commissioners that if we get into that type of situation again, we are going to have to talk seriously about moving those board seats to other counties so we have a better chance of getting a qualified person to join us, because we just can't sit there with a seat vacant.

We are discussing that with the state and that's another area where they are wanting clarification but they are being pretty firm about that fact and they are just not going to have it anymore. I hope every county is able to fill both their seats but if we run into a situation where they can't then we are going to have to do something about that.

Bill D. asked Jim D. if the law requires two people from every county how can you bypass that?

Jim D. stated the law doesn't, our bylaws do and it has to be addressed in our bylaws, and I hope Bill that we don't have to do that because we have had that two seats per county for years now, but after this monitoring I am guaranteeing you that they are saying they don't want to have that.

Collin Brink asked on the retired people that can't serve, how would we go about addressing it, because I am assuming they are saying the retired people are not active anymore in the community, which is not necessarily true.

Jim D. said the difference is they are private sector slots and if you are retired, if you say you are retired, you are also not active in a business, which a private sector slot person is supposed to be. That's where the hook is. Now if you represent a community based organization or something like that you can be retired, but when you enter that private sector and you say you are retired you are saying you are not active in any business.

Collin Brink asked if that was covered under the law or is that bylaws? Jim D. stated that is law.

Jim D. stated that those things happen, he realizes that. Someone could join this board and while they are on the board at some period in time they could retire, those things happen. I am not saying that anybody intentionally did anything, I am saying that they are saying apparently they caught it and they want it cleared up.

Collin B. stated it's an issue because I know we have a hard time filling them. Jim D. stated like Bill D. brought up a while ago about this FEIN number stuff it is just getting more stringent.

Earl H. asked Harold H. if he had any idea of someone in mind to do this job? Harold H. stated he has been trying to find someone to fill the seat but hasn't had any luck.

Earl H. stated he had a little talk with Jan V. on how can he do this job on oversight well, and one of the things we agreed on is have it in writing, and so my suggestion would be to think about adding a clause to the bylaws that says in special circumstances the board would waiver two people per county and assign that to some other slot.

Jim D. said we will work on that wording because I really want the caucus involved in that too because I don't want to be taking seats away from a county and the commission sitting there objecting.

Sarah G. asked if Jim D. could explain to her since she has now moved to a private sector slot, what is considered public sector besides like city county government, or like prisons for example would be considered a public sector, or a school system? Jim D. stated right.

Jim D. said he has already talked with Eddie Brickner that we need to replace that individual and my understanding is he is working on it.

Mary H. asked if Callaway County has three slots now? Jim D. stated you have two county slots and one regional slot which is Stacy Minnick.

Jim D. stated there is three at-large seats which gives us a total membership of forty one when we are fully seated, which is the number of people we are going to have to recertify in this process.

Nancy M. asked if those three at-large people can be from any county? Jim D. stated yes. Nancy M. asked which of the counties do we not have total representation from? Jim D. stated Moniteau and Osage is a problem, and we have one in Cooper that doesn't attend, and we have got one in Camden.

Jan V. stated we have to keep it at 51% overall private. Jim D. stated we were actually as far as the board's structure over 51%, but the problem being what's causing the issue is when you are sitting there with vacant seats, especially for two years that affects your 51% issue. It is really something that we are going to have to work on. Harold H. has already said he has been trying to work on it and I know Commissioner Kunze has been working on it for Moniteau, but we are going to have to get serious about it because all of these seats are going to need filled because of our recertification process. The state has already told me they are going to be watching it close.

Earl H. asked Linda if we had Crawford County already certified? Nothing has been recertified because we haven't sent anything yet to the state.

Jim D. stated the way the process works is the forms that everyone turns into Linda are nomination forms, then we take those forms to the caucus who actually is the final stamp before we send it to the state so that the commissioner will be involved.

David M. asked Jim if the state requires an attendance form on a monthly or quarterly basis from this board? Jim D. stated they are not currently but I think they are going there. David stated that some of their programs are required to do that now and thought it would probably trickle down. The state is making the board more accountable and is making sure you are in attendance so he does think it is important that if you are a board member you make that effort to attend.

Jim D. stated right, the reason they may want the attendance sheet is you may have board seats filled but like the person I just referenced in Cooper County never comes. That is not what they want and really that's not what we want.

Patrick Kelly asked if they have given us a deadline? Jim D. stated right now for the recertification process as a whole is January 15, 2013. It was a lot earlier than that but they extended it, but we are on a different timeline for this retiree issue because that was beyond recertification, that was DOL monitoring.

Jim D. stated speaking of the Department of Labor we have two DOL representatives in the back of the room and I would like to ask them to stand and introduce themselves. Wayne Hakes and Stacie Gurin from the DOL Kansas City office introduced themselves.

Jim D. said he was glad to have them with us.

NEG Disaster Grant Update

Earl H. asked Trish and Paula to give an update on the NEG program.

Trish Rogers gave an update on Washington County. They continue to do cleanup work. The last conversation she had with road crew supervisors we were approximately 65-70% complete with those work assignments.

Alex Blackwell sent an email to us, apparently there is still some money available to us in that grant. The state wants to know if we had enough work that we could extend the grant to September 30, 2013 instead of ending it on June 30, 2013 and we believe that we do have.

There was also a question did we feel that we had enough work to continue it through June of 2014, and I am not sure that we do. It sounds like September 30 of 2013 is going to be our ending date based on what we have left to do.

Alex B. clarified that they have actually changed this and none of the work can continue past September 30, 2013.

Paula Curtman gave an update on Miller County. Currently there are two work crews working in Miller County. We have about 12 people employed on that now, but there is a new worksite called Apperson Electric that has moved into Eldon and they have hired 3 or 4 of our workers because they are full time, we hated to give them up but we can't blame them for wanting to go fulltime. We should be done by 2013 if not before.

Jim D. said in the case of that Apperson company, these people are putting in a natural gas pipeline and they are paying \$11/hour for laborers, and \$15/hr for equipment operators and the project requires that we pay \$10/hr. The project is really designed to provide some people some temporary employment that's dealing with unemployment. We are getting some people who are getting some very good jobs in the private sector which will probably not be permanent forever but certainly long enough to get this new pipeline project, so I really think this is a good development and good for the people up in Eldon.

Monthly Reports

Earl H. asked if there were any questions or concerns about the monthly reports. The August reports were distributed to C-WIB members in advance of the meeting.

Jim D. stated that you can see from the traffic report we are running just under 15,000 customers a month in the career center system and our county offices have unemployment check-in, which is still way down from when we had huge numbers of about 30,000 plus. You will see the Camdenton office start coming up because of the Lake area's traditional seasonal unemployment situation, and they are starting to see quite a few new claims right now, like restaurants closing for the season and things of that nature.

The AEL number in Camdenton which is very high right now is because of the Modine factory closing, because a lot of those people who do not have a high school diploma are being put into AEL, so they can be sent on to other educational training. The AEL lab is full both during the day and at night.

Earl H. asked if there were any questions about the monthly traffic reports? Earl H. asked Alan if there were any September activity.

Alan Galindo presented a handout to the board and gave a report on the Rapid Response program to date. Earl H. thanked Alan for his report.

SPYC 2012 Grant Update

Alex Blackwell handed out a written report to the board.

Trish stated that one of the things that we have been working on with this grant is that we started out receiving the Community Block Development Grant funding (CBDG), and at the beginning the state was of the opinion we would also be receiving Neighborhood Assistance Program funding (NAP). When the participants were put on our plan was to take them out of the CBDG and move them over into the NAP program to finish up their time. Unfortunately that NAP funding did not come through. We are coming to a very quick closure. The good thing now is the parks have agreed that they have a pot of money they can use to continue some of these youth to the end of the program date, which was October 31, 2012. So there may be some of the youth that can continue until October 31 but they will be paid by the parks. It's been a little different year for us this year because we have been sitting here working diligently anticipating we are going to receive more money and when it didn't come through we had to let kids know they will be transferring out of one program but hopefully you've been a good worker and the parks going to pick you up.

We've completed several jobs and haven't had hardly any problems at all that I am aware of in our area. I think it's been a good program overall. Just coming to an end quicker than we thought.

Earl H. asked how will the state look at this? Joyce D. stated that their kids will still be working on the CBDG program in October because they still had some money left so they are going to be looking at it and try to use all their money up.

Earl H. stated so we have about 90% of our goal accomplished is that good, bad or indifferent? Trish stated she thought it should be good. We have no control over the grants the state has applied for. The state thought they were going to receive that money and so they encouraged us to get these kids on as soon as possible and the hours were set that we were going to operate. When the grant didn't come through then that forced us to make our decision that we would have to pull kids off jobs then. The parks have been pleased with the work that we've done and we've been able to fill positions fairly quickly and have been able to keep kids working and not having a lot of drop outs. Did we get 150% this year no, but we got 90% and we certainly performed a lot of work during the summer and we worked with the state and the parks. I think it should be good.

Jan V. asked Earl if he wanted to review this report, which is of our performance measures, as it was something that was prepared especially for him. Alex is our job stat person who can explain that to you if you are interested. Earl H. said he thought he would bring that up during the full board meeting.

Joyce Jones asked Earl if we could ask Alan Galindo to give a verbal report that we ask each time, I think it would be interesting for us to know. Earl H. stated I intend to ask him each time and we could also ask Linda to include it in the minutes. I was going to ask Linda to do that. I don't think we will have any objection to do that.

Jim Dickerson made a motion to adjourn the committee, and Tina Sooter seconded; there were no objections. The Oversight Committee adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

MINUTES OF THE C-WIB BUDGET COMMITTEE

September 26, 2012

Committee Chair David Miller called the Budget Committee to order at 11:57 a.m.

Committee members present were Bill Debo, Jim Dickerson, Patrick Kelly, David Miller, and Nancy Montgomery.

C-WIB members in attendance were Collin Brink, Betty Jo Brooks, T.R. Dudley, Sarah Gallagher, Sharon Gibson, Kathy Groves, Harold Haldiman, Earl Horsefield, Mary Hughes, W.D. Hunter, Joyce Jones, Janet Kinnett, Vicki Nelson, Doug Piant, Rick Robertson, Tina Sooter, and John Vaughn.

C-WIB staff in attendance included Executive Director Jan Vaughn, Alex Blackwell, Alan Galindo, Linda Gray, and Jacque Moreland.

Other attendees included Joyce Davis of Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), Trish Rogers of Central Ozarks Private Industry Council (COPIC), Paula Curtman of Lake of the Ozarks Employment Services (LOES), and Wayne Hakes and Stacie Gurin of the Department of Labor.

Minutes

Nancy Montgomery made a motion to approve the July 25, 2012 minutes, and Kathy Groves seconded; the Budget Committee approved the minutes as written.

Bill D. asked a question to Jim D. you had a closed session meeting, but you had it open session until the end of the meeting, making it closed retroactive back to the beginning. It's not a question of what you did, it is unethical if not illegal. How do you close the meeting at the end of the meeting, and make it retro-back to the beginning of the meeting? This was the July 19, 2012 special meeting.

Jim D. stated I'm sorry Bill, this doesn't include that, we are just doing budget committee meeting minutes right now. I told you wrong and I apologize for that.

Bill D. stated he would accept the July 25, 2012 minutes. David Miller asked if there were any more discussion on the July 25, 2012 minutes? There being none he asked for a vote. All in favor, none opposed, motion carried.

Monthly Financials

Jacque Moreland presented the budget for PY2012 as of August 31, 2012. The first page is our overall budget this year. The budget is about 7.3 million. We are 20% expended overall. C-WIB Administrative Entity is at 14%, CMCA is at 26%, COPIC 24%, LOES 18%. This includes all of our carryover funding and all of our youth funding. Right now the budgets are set as they are with the extension going through September 30, 2012. The reason that COPIC and LOES is higher is because their NEG funding is included in their budget.

We've given the subcontractors enough to run the first three months, but we have given them additional funds in their COT's because this is the time that they need to start participants in

school. We've given them more than just the three months in OJT and supportive services so that way none of the participants suffer because we have not got the contracts out yet.

The next couple of pages are the report amounts that Jacque has been presenting which shows our expenditures by line item. It is a Statement of Revenues and Expenditures report from August 1, 2012 through August 31, 2012. The first column is just the month of August, the second column is our year to date.

The next pages reflect what Patrick Kelly had said about doing a comparison from last year to this year. The first columns shows you what we spent as of August 31, 2012, the middle column is where we were as of August 31, 2011, and the last column shows the percentage of change and it list everything by line item.

Nancy M. asked what the expenditure on page 1, Management Information Systems is? Jacque M. explained this is for the maintenance fee agreement on the MIP system she runs for accounting and inventory. It is an annual contract.

Nancy M. asked what the \$1500 under supplies was for? Office supplies or equipment? Jacque M. replied that everything we do that is not considered equipment is a supply. David M. asked Jacque what the definition of equipment was? Jacque stated that the DOL reasons anything \$5,000 and above. Right now we put anything that is \$250 and above we put that in the equipment category, and she inventories anything over that.

Nancy M. asked about the internet expense on page 2. Jacque explained this was for our T-1 line that that runs through MORENET that we pay for COPIC and LOES. Nancy asked why is it showing higher this year than from last year? Jacque explained it depends on what time of the year we pay it.

Nancy M. asked about other transportation lease on page 2. Jacque explained it is for the NEG and DRJP grants for the trucks they use. It is not ours, it shows it is COPIC's or LOES. Trish R. asked if it was possible for the subcontractors to receive a copy of this report for their monitoring report? David M. stated he didn't see a problem with that. Jacque stated she can show Trish's accounting person how to do it.

David M. asked if there was anything in this report that this group or board needs to be concerned about? Jacque M. stated that recently, she found out at the financial round table that this year, they are really going to be watching our expenditure and obligation levels. Before we always had to be 80% obligated and as close to 70% expended as possible. They tell me that this year the Fed's are wanting us to be as much as possible expended by the end of the year, because the DOL funds are basically use it or lose it. They wanted us to spend, especially in participant categories. We need to spend that money on participants and not just obligate it and carry so much over to the next year.

Nancy M. asked if the end of the year was June 30th? Jacque stated yes, that we have it all in contract and have it obligated out but our subcontractors have not spent their amount. They carryover. We can carryover a certain amount but we want our subcontractors to spend their amount.

Jacque M. stated that last time at the financial round table they talked about the participant cost, they really want to see a lot more in supportive services and things like that. We are here

to get people jobs and we should give them all the support we can, especially if we have it in our budget and available.

Sarah G. asked about page 1. Is that what we spent last year in subscriptions and dues? Jacque stated yes, that is what we spent last year as of August 2011. This year we have only spent \$1282. Sarah wondered which organizations the dues were to? Jacque stated that most of ours were to the National Workforce Association (NWA), the National Workforce Board Association (NWB), the MAWD association, and the National Association of Workforce Development Professional (NAWDP), and the Missouri Economic Development Council (MEDC).

Sarah asked if the subscriptions are to like trade magazines? Jacque stated we have one Human Resource magazine, and every few years we update our Fair Labor Standards Act book. We get updates on it regularly but every few years we just update the whole book.

David Miller asked if there were any further discussion? There was none.

Nancy M. made a motion to approve the financial budget, and Patrick Kelly seconded; there were no objections. Motion carried.

Revision of the Travel Policy

Jacque Moreland reported on the revision of the travel policy. Right now our travel policy has been whatever is considered reasonable, but that is the one thing we were written up on the financial side by the DOL. It was basically we spend too much on meals and things like that, and that we order too much food for our board meeting. You will notice Linda is going to really be pushing on Monday to find out whether or not you are going to be here so I can make sure I have the board count accurate for the food.

The state recommended that we follow their travel policy. Basically you are going to go from charging whatever you want within reason for what you eat for meals, to a per diem rate. CONUS will be checked every time you go. If you are going to go to a conference, I will get on the website and find out how much it is going to cost and what is allowed minus any meals that are going to be provided by the conference. We will just give you that in advance, that way you won't have to keep receipts or anything like that. Basically what you get is what you get and if you want to spend more, that is up to you.

Nancy M. asked what happens to the excess money? Jacque explained the per diem rate is how the state does it and you must be in a twelve hour travel status to be reimbursed for meals. Right now any meals reimbursed when you're not in the travel status should be reported on a 1099 or W2 form.

David M. asked if the policy in front of us is a mirror of the state's policy. Jacque stated this policy reflects the items that apply the most to us. In special circumstances we will refer to the state's policy and guidelines. Jacque stated they have asked us to have our subcontractors doing this.

Tina S. stated that in one of our previous meetings we talked about having travel logs for all of our company cars. Are we going to make sure that everyone does that? Are still some of them not? Where do we stand on that?

Jacque stated if you tell me to start getting those, I will require that they be submitted to me during the financial monitoring. Tina stated she thinks we should. Jacque stated she might also be revising our travel policy to include the odometer readings, since this is something that the state calls for, and we will just have the staff put down the odometer reading every time.

Nancy M. said on that line too, we should have some assigned vehicles that aren't being used that day, is there a reason why other staff members can't use those? David M. asked if we could try and stay on task here please. Nancy M. said ok. David M. said we are looking at the travel reimbursement policy.

David M. said he has read through it and it looks great and is tailored for us, the only thing he sees is that it says 7 a.m. and should probably say p.m. Jacque said that is an error and she will correct it to p.m. David M. asked if there was a motion to accept the travel reimbursement policy. Bill Debo made a motion to accept the travel reimbursement policy, and Nancy M. seconded the motion. David M. asked if there were any further discussion? There being none, all in favor, none opposed, motion carried.

Bill D. commented that Tina S. has brought up the subject of mileage. David M. asked if that was something for the budget committee to handle with on the bylaws? Jim D. stated actually we need to develop a policy on it. I don't disagree with what you said, but why don't you give us a chance to work with Jacque and give a policy to present, so it will be in writing. David M. said that would be great, he thinks that's a great idea.

Vicki N. stated she thinks the policy on the vehicles needs to be consistent. David M. stated he thinks that is a great statement.

Special Personnel Committee

David M. said the agenda has Jim's name by it. Jim D. said no that is wrong and he should have caught it. David M. said ok whose name did you want beside it? Jim D. said he thinks Nancy, who has been designated by the committee.

Nancy M. stated that on September 20, 2012 the special personnel committee met here in Jefferson City to review the information. Hopefully everyone has a copy. Nancy stated that we were commissioned to review and discuss and recommend what wage increases for C-WIB staff and put before the budget committee, so this presentation is to the budget committee.

Nancy M. stated you can see the attached salary increases as described as performance based increases. There is an attached spreadsheet for you. The suggested performance based increases are listed here if you would like me to read those I can, or you can see them that's fine. These issues were discussed and authorized by our chairperson Jim Dickerson, and presented for consideration of the budget committee, C-WIB board and Caucus.

We are presenting a 4% bucket amount of contributing funds allocated for raises to the subcontractors. At this time we have still not had a request submitted by the subcontractors overview board because the RFP's have not been approved yet, so that's still in limbo, so I wanted to make that real clear. We also are suggesting a CAP on vacation hours that they can carryover of 240 hours. We have done research and pretty much that's industry standard. Raises recommended to the budget committee and C-WIB board will be defined as performance based raises, no cost of living adjustment COLA's are recommended.

Nancy M. stated the other thing on our list last time was the AFLAC benefits. We determined we are not asking for that to be changed, so I didn't include that on this. The AFLAC will remain in place according to our recommendations. Are there any questions or concerns?

Jim D. said basically Nancy, though you're asking the budget committee at this point, if we have \$9,098.40 to fund the raises the committee has proposed. Nancy said right. As well as, the 4% bucket amounts that are being proposed for the subcontractors. Nancy said right. Jim D. said the other items like the 240 hours cap and that type of thing are actually personnel issues, not budget issues, that's where those need to go.

Nancy M. stated so really the only two items we are looking at as the budget committee are the raises and the 4% bucket amount contributing funds allocated to raises for the subcontractors.

Jim D. stated so I guess Jacque our question is do we have the funds, and Jacque stated that yes we do have admin dollars. On the training dollars, she would have to go through that all again. The WIB staff is paid out of admin dollars and we have plenty of that.

Jim D. stated that he would think we would because the raises that were previously proposed we had money for that. We certainly should have the money for what's here right now.

Earl H. asked Jim D. what is the function of the budget committee now as far as what they do with these recommendations?

Jim D. stated the full list of recommendations will go to the full board here after lunch, but the budget committee is only dealing with budget. So it would be a function of the budget committee coming to the board and telling the full board whether the money is available to fund the raises proposed.

John Vaughn asked "shouldn't the special report have an effective date"? Nancy M. stated the effective date rolls back to July 1, 2012. John V. asked shouldn't the report say that? Nancy M. stated that was already in a proposal made by Russ Unger. Jim D stated it has already passed the full board and is retroactive.

Bill D. said that vote was for 30 days and you went passed the 30 day limit. Jim D. stated it went before an Adhoc committee. Bill D. stated the original motion passed, do we have to do something with that? Jim D. stated no. Bill D. stated you are going to have to do something with the motion as it was passed by the full board. You are going to have to amend it or rescind it. Jim D. said the full board froze the salaries. Bill D. stated that is right, they froze the salaries but that was for 30 days, that was all. Nancy M. stated at the full board meeting we can address that. Bill D. stated that 30 days has passed and you are going to have to either amend it or rescind it. The full board is going to have to do that. Nancy M. stated that is not an issue at this time.

David Miller said correct me if I am wrong, but what is before the budget committee right now is a recommendation from the special personnel committee and we are to vote on whether we have funds available for these raises that we are giving to the current C-WIB staff, and a bucket amount for contractors. Nancy M. stated correct.

Earl Horsefield stated he needed to ask Jim D. a question. When we went through the special committee originally Jan Vaughn was included, and when we went through the special

committee she was in a separate category, and that was handled separately. Now what are we going to do about that? Jim D. stated, I think that occurred because of different people doing evaluations and also on the chart, the original chart, Jan was listed separately from the rest of the staff so... Earl H. stated but we did have to vote on her raise. Jim D. stated yes you all did.

David Miller said he has a question as the budget chair. On the 4% bucket amount for the contractors, now correct me if I am speaking out of turn. The contractors if they need a raise or want a raise, I believe they would build that into their budget and request it from C-WIB to increase salaries so fit for their agencies, their department, or their program. I don't know that it should be a part of this board to determine if we will or will not give them a 4% raise. That is just a comment.

Nancy M. stated the 4% amount is 4% of their budget to give to them to allocate up to 4%. They can give zero raises if they want to, it's up to 4%. Nancy said she understands what David is saying, but she guesses just because the RFP's have not been approved yet we won't have anything from the subcontractors requesting, because they can't, they are not even hired yet.

Nancy M. stated we could table that if you like. Earl H. stated we did check if the money was available if that is what your are asking. So when this goes to the full board they can vote with the understanding the money is available.

Mary Hughes stated she thinks the RFP's should be separate from this kind of a committee report. A request for them to have a line item for salary increase needs to come from the subcontractors, and if the people that are reviewing the RFP's say they don't want to give them the salary raise then they don't give them that money. That is a separate process that we do not need to be involved in.

David Miller stated he does not disagree with Mary and thinks that that is probably a correct statement, because I don't know that this board should be dabbling in what a contractor gives as far as a raise. If they want to give 10% and can afford it, I believe they should be able to do that on their own.

Earl Horsefield stated there is a supposed subcommittee that grapples with this problem that is over the contractors, correct Jim? Jim D. said right, but David I think at this point, and I don't disagree with what you are saying, at this point due to the unique time frame with this RFP situation when the bidders submitted bids, especially our existing contractors, they obviously didn't include raises, because they had at that point no right to deal with 4% or any other percent. So I think at this point it's only a guideline because what's going to end up having to happen is what you said, and that is the subcontractors are going to have to come back and ask for some sum of money for raises if they choose to give them. So there is another step, this isn't automatically granting a 4% raise or any percent. At this point it is a guideline the way I understand it, but they still have to come back and ask for an increase in their contracts and their funding in order to grant raises unless they've got a big pot of money somewhere.

David Miller said ok, so based on the special personnel committee recommendation on the C-WIB salary increases for the current staff and 4% bucket amount that is being presented here today, money is available for these dollar amounts within the budget currently,

David Miller stated he would entertain a motion to push this up the ladder to the board. Jim Dickerson stated so moved. David Miller said he has a motion, does he have a second? Nancy M. seconded the motion.

David M. asked if there were any other discussion? Bill Debo stated yes there is.

Bill D. stated that should be two different motions. We have two completely separate items there. Staff raises and then contractor raises. Now that is completely two separate issues. Patrick Kelly stated from a business standpoint I totally agree.

Nancy M. stated that all we are doing is making sure there is enough money here. Then when it goes to the full board then it will be separate issues. We are just determining if there is enough money.

Patrick Kelly said but all you have done is allow the subcontractors to know. You have already told them that they've got a 4% bucket that they can draw from. In our aspect and from a business perspective we should be getting the lowest dollar proposal we can out of them. Several board members agreed. Patrick K. stated so you have already told them that they can increase their proposal to us by 4%. Mary Hughes agreed with Patrick.

Earl H. stated we've told them what's available, and they know that anyway. Patrick K. stated he knows that but we shouldn't be telling them and should be trying to get the lowest bid possible.

Jim D. stated that they will all have to come back, each contractor, whoever they are, and we don't know who they will be for sure at this point, will have to come back to this budget committee and then go to the full board asking for an increase in funding for whatever raises they are proposing. So this isn't an approval of final raises, in other words, we are not sitting here saying you get 10% or 20% or whatever.

Patrick Kelly stated he agrees with what Bill D. said it should be two separate issues. Jim D. stated well I have a problem with that.

Sarah Gallagher stated she would like to make a comment. All of this to include this special committee, and everything came out of a special circumstance that we found ourselves in and that included them and that included the C-WIB staff and so when a committee was chosen to put this together and make some recommendations, that's what we were asked to do. This probably would not maybe never happen again, because everything had been addressed and everything was on the table and everybody was talking about it and it was under discussion and that's how it is that we got to look at those things on there. That's how I remember it.

Nancy M. stated and the only thing we are saying is that the money is available. That's not to say that the full WIB board is going to approve 4%. The full WIB board might say we are not going to approve anything.

Vicki Nelson stated she still agrees with Patrick. She thinks Patrick's point is we should be looking for the lowest bid. We have openly suggested, whether they come back and ask, but we have openly suggested for these contractors to have a higher bid.

David Miller stated let me tell you where I am at right now, I have a motion and a second on the floor. If it's withdrawn, we can go back and redo this. If we do not withdraw that motion then we will vote on the motion, whether you are in favor or are against, and if we have to take a roll call we will take a roll call. If it passes fine, if it fails then we can go back with a second question. That is up to this budget committee group that is here today, is that correct?

Jim D. said that is correct and like he already said he doesn't have a problem separating the motions, and since he made the motion he will withdraw it and the second has to withdraw. Nancy M. was the second and she stated I withdraw. David Miller stated we have a withdrawal of the motion.

Jim D. stated that now he will make a motion for the budget committee to report to the board that we have the necessary funds that Jacque has already verified, to fund the raises in the committee report. David Miller corrected the statement that it is for C-WIB staff. Jim D. stated correct, for C-WIB staff.

David Miller stated he has a motion on the floor now for C-WIB staff for salary increases. We do have the budget for those increases. The motion is on the floor, do I have a second? Nancy M. seconded the motion. David M. asked if there were any discussion on this vote? Bearing none we will vote on that motion. All in favor say aye, all opposed say nay. There were none opposed, the motion carried.

Earl Horsefield asked David Miller if he would read off the names of the budget committee members. David M. read the list of budget committee members to include himself, Nancy Montgomery, Bill Debo, Denise Boeckmann, Patrick Kelly, and Shauna Qualls.

Earl H. stated so you have 3 members here on the budget committee. David M. stated we have four if you count me.

David Miller said now on the other, he will entertain a motion as presented by the special personnel committee recommendation that we do have funding available for up to a 4% bucket amount for the subcontractors this year.

Nancy M. made a motion that we accept a 4% bucket amount contributing funds allocated to raises for the subcontractors pending the request to be submitted by the subcontractor over-review board.

David Miller stated he has a motion does he hear a second? Mary Hughes asked David that is she to understand that the review committee that looks at the RFP's, they know that this amount of money is available in the salary category if they need a salary increase, is this correct?

David Miller stated sorry Mary, but I have a motion on the floor, do I have a second?

Jim D. stated Nancy in view of our discussion, I think that we leave that committee recommendation there as a guideline because we have already discussed the contractors are going to have to come back to this budget committee, and the full board and ask for whatever amount of money they need for whatever amount of raises they propose.

Nancy M. stated she will entertain a motion that we table the decision on the subcontractor 4% bucket amount. A board member said she will just need to withdraw her motion. Jim D. stated if she would just withdraw her motion because they are still going to have to go through the same steps they would anyhow whether the motion passed or not.

Joyce Jones stated she has a question for David Miller. We have nothing for one of our people, is this an appropriate time or do I need to make a motion to give Jan Vaughn a 4% raise and put Alan Galindo at a 4 % raise? Or is this something for later?

Jim Dickerson stated that is something Joyce that will happen at full board, ok.

T.R. Dudley asked if he could interject something not being a member of the committee? David Miller said yes. T.R. asked if it would be appropriate to say that due to extenuating circumstances with the RFP, special consideration would be given to raises for the contractors without having an amount? Or you don't need a motion at all?

Jim D. stated he didn't think so because as we've discussed numerous times T.R., their organizations, their agencies will come up with a proposal for increases, or maybe they won't. I don't know, that's going to be up to them. Then that is when they come back to this committee and they've heard the discussion of this group as well as the full board. So I just think we are better off to let them do that and to come back to this committee with an amount. We then have a chance to work with Jacque and others to determine for the committee whether it's there or not. Then it will go to the full board for their final decision.

Bill D. stated he agreed with Jim. We have never turned them down on anything before. If they need something they need to ask. Jim D. said it's not that they are sitting there thinking that it's going to be a big goose egg. He thinks that is a clean way of doing it. T.R. Dudley said that they may not know that that is available to them. Jim D. said again, that they have heard enough of the discussion to know, it is a pretty poorly kept secret by now. He thinks this will work better for the committee and probably for the board at that point.

David Miller asked if there were any other comments? There were none.

Nancy Montgomery made a motion to adjourn the committee, and Bill Debo seconded; there were no objections. The Budget Committee meeting adjourned at 12:36 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL REGION WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD

September 26, 2012

Chairman Jim Dickerson called the Board to order at 1:30 p.m.

C-WIB members in attendance were Collin Brink, Betty Jo Brooks, Bill Debo, Jim Dickerson, T.R. Dudley, Sarah Gallagher, Sharon Gibson, Kathy Groves, Harold Haldiman, Earl Horsefield, Mary Hughes, W. D. Hunter, Joyce Jones, Patrick Kelly, Janet Kinnett, David Miller, Nancy Montgomery, Vicki Nelson, Doug Piant, Rick Robertson, Tina Sooter, and John Vaughn.

C-WIB staff in attendance included Executive Director Jan Vaughn, Alex Blackwell, Alan Galindo, Linda Gray, and Jacque Moreland.

Other attendees included Joyce Davis of Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), Trish Rogers of Central Ozarks Private Industry Council (COPIIC), Paula Curtman of Lake of the Ozarks Employment Services (LOES), and Wayne Hakes and Stacie Gurin of the Department of Labor.

Jim Dickerson asked to amend the agenda to add the Special Personnel Committee report in between the Oversight and Budget reports. The Budget will be addressing the monetary end of that report.

Jim D. asked for a motion to do that and Nancy M. made the motion. Sarah Gallagher seconded the motion. Motion carried, none opposed. The agenda is amended to include the special personnel committee report.

Minutes

Jim Dickerson stated the first thing on the agenda is the minutes, we will be addressing only the minutes of the full board meeting and I will ask the special personnel committee to address their own minutes at their meeting. Bill I understood your comment earlier and I will see that's addressed, ok. So we will be dealing with the full board minutes of July 25 and August 22, 2012 Executive minutes and I will entertain a motion to approve them. Nancy M. made a motion to approve the minutes and Janet Kinnett seconded. All in favor none opposed, motion passed.

Planning Committee

The Planning Committee met today and I think most all of you were here except Betty Jo. Discussion was held on the RFP's and where we are with that process, and we are working through that as we go along.

Bill Debo asked Jim D. if he could be more specific on what it is they are wanting or asking us to provide? Jim D. stated they are just asking for instance to know what list of bidders that we sent the bid package to on the RFP's. It's one of those types of process issues that we are talking about and like I said all that's part of the Department of Labor review according to the state. So that's where we are it's one of those process things that we can fire back at the state quickly as they ask for it, but beyond that we can't rush things. I wish that I could say more about it but I really can't.

Jim D. stated that we also discussed our WIB recertification. The deadline for that is January 15, 2013 which is better than the previous deadline that we had. We talked about some of the items regarding the membership and the report that we received from the state and Department of Labor. I mentioned to you that that report says that four private sector members, in phone interviews with the DOL said they were retired and this is an issue we've got to deal with.

We are on a different time line on that issue than we are on the recertification. I mentioned in a meeting that another issue we have had is two board seats that have been vacant for two years and I mentioned the counties. Harold Haldiman has volunteered and has been working on the seat in Moniteau. Frankly I think the DOL knows that for a lot of private sector people it's hard to agree to serve on the WIB, especially with the small business person because when their gone their business isn't open many times.

These are issues that we will be dealing with and we will be talking with the state about how we are going to attract private sector people. We do have a lot of good private sector people on this board. I am not saying that there is an issue, but I do want if there is any of you who said something that you were retired, I need to talk with you on an individual basis and maybe we can work through that.

Joyce Jones commented that 51% of the board needs to be private sector. Jim D. said that over 51% of our seats are allocated to private sector. Now where you slide off down the slope is where you have two vacancies for two years. And then if we did have private sector people who told the DOL, and I don't have any reason at all that they misreported this, that they were retired, that's not going to wash, ok.

Oversight Committee

Earl Horsefield reported the Oversight Committee met and approved the minutes of the July 25 and August 22, 2012 meetings. He will give an overall summary as most everyone was present during the oversight committee.

Discussion was held on the WIB membership. We had a question about Moniteau, Osage, and Camden Counties board member vacancies and Jim D. spoke about it at length with discussion on private sector membership.

Discussion was held on DOL monitoring report and response. A report was also given on the NEG disaster grant by Paula and Trish.

The number of traffic coming through the career center doors is down. Camdenton is having a difficult time placing the people laid off from the Modine Manufacturing plant. There is a lot of AEL training type issues and classes are being utilized.

Alan Galindo gave a Rapid Response report. Discussion was held on tier one and two of UI benefits. Alan talked specifically about the California Missouri turkey plant closing one of its shifts.

An update was given on the SPYC 2012 grant handout. There was 104 total of people served and met 100% of their goal, but some of the funding did not come through with one of the people we partnership with. Some of the people that Joyce had are still working.

Earl H. asked Mary Hughes who was the former Chairman of the Oversight Committee for some time, if she would give a summary of her insight to the Oversight Committee.

Mary H. stated the main focus she took to the board was to make sure we were doing the things we were supposed to and doing them in the correct manner, and that we followed the rules. We experience a lot of job change and growth and the responsibilities for the staff increase immeasurably during this time and I was concerned about their health and mental outlook in their job. It was very stressful for them. I am also concerned about the organization that in times like this sometimes people leave and I didn't want to wake up one day and see anyone leave and us be understaffed. I have been very concerned about those issues.

Earl H. thanked Mary H. and assured her that would be part of his concern in how to keep our people and treat our people fairly, and maybe a better way of paying for performance.

Jim D. stated the Oversight Committee was under Mary H. Chairmanship and at one time all that committee dealt with was whether we met performance measures or not. Gradually we moved to how the career centers are doing in addition to the performance measures. In fact now more of our discussion in my view is about the career centers and functional leaders than of course it is about the performance standards. There has been a lot of change and I am sure there will be more.

Earl H. stated and of course we are under a new model by Julie Gibson at the state in the way we are doing things at the career centers.

Special Personnel Committee Report

Nancy M. reported the Special Committee meeting was held last Thursday, September 20, 2012. Hopefully everyone should have a copy of the suggestions and recommendations. We were commissioned to review, discuss, and recommend wage increases for the C-WIB staff, and honestly at this time I believe we should go into closed session.

Jim D. stated you can stay in open session as long as you are only talking about the committee's recommendation. When we get into a discussion or go forward in a discussion if it occurs, of the reason for the recommendations and that gets into discussion of individual evaluations then I think we are in closed session. Nancy M. stated ok.

Nancy M. stated you have an attached summary of the salary increases described as performance based increases that are listed. Additional issues discussed and authorized by the Chairperson Jim Dickerson were:

A 4% bucket amount of contributing funds allocated for raises for the subcontractors

Putting a CAP on vacation hours with a carryover of 240 hours.

The raises recommended to the budget committee to C-WIB described as performance based raise.

No cost of living adjustment (COLA) is recommended at this time.

Nancy M. stated one thing we do want to remove from here is the elimination of the AFLAC benefits. Does anyone have any discussion?

Earl H. commented that this went before the budget committee before being presented to the board.

Jim D. stated that it is his understanding, and he visited with Joyce Jones a little bit about this, as you know I did not participate at all in discussing any of the raises. In fact with everyone's but Jan's case, I wasn't even in the meeting. Nancy M. stated that's correct.

Jim D. stated he wants to describe his understanding of the process the committee followed. Then since I wasn't at, especially the ones not involved but Jan's, you will have to correct me if I am wrong. My understanding, and you all have minutes in front of you, was that you all met with Jan and she discussed with you every person's evaluation. Nancy M. stated that is correct. My further understanding is in cases where you didn't recommend the 4%, that the committee felt like Jan had pointed out issues in evaluations, whether they were cleared up by the time you met or not, that had occurred over the past year. Jim stated that the parts of the meetings that he has been able to sit in on, he thinks that you all have been professional. I have three professional HR people on there, Stacy, Nancy, and Kathy Groves. I had some other good people on there like Joyce, Earl, and Sarah. I didn't in any of your meetings hear any discussion of we don't like this one or that one, so of that committee is that your view of the process? Sarah, Nancy and Earl stated yes.

Jim D. stated he wanted everyone to understand how all of that occurred even though I made a point of not suggesting any raises or non raises for anyone and let the committee have their own discussion and make their own motions and vote and I wasn't voting. Nancy M. stated that is correct.

Mary H. asked if there is a process for the staff if a person disagrees with their appraisal and wants a change or review, is there a process in place for that? Jim D. said there is a process. We go over the evaluation with the employee and everybody signs it. The employee is allowed time to respond. At that response level time is when any disagreement might arise, and obviously people around the table like David and others doing evaluations, and Janet does personnel evaluations, and certainly our HR people do, but not everyone is going to agree with their evaluation. Period. I look at an evaluation as a time to be constructive, a time to point out things the evaluator might see that need to be improved. Quite frankly sometimes I'm sure the evaluator thinks they are seeing things that they are not. That's just human nature, but yet there is that opportunity.

Mary H. stated that she knew there was one but wanted to make sure. She received in the mail a packet from Alan Galindo about his appraisal and I assumed everyone had received it? Jim D. said he thought so.

Mary H. asked if there was any resolution made to that complaint at the time it was made? Jim D. stated we need to be careful there, and Nancy M. stated we need to go into closed session. Jim D. stated he didn't want to slide into discussing somebody's evaluation. Mary H. stated she did not want to either, but she would like to know so that we can move forward in this process in this situation.

Jim D. stated then we would need to go into closed session so that we could discuss evaluation issues. Mary made a motion to go into closed session. Janet Kinnett seconded the motion. Jim D. stated it would need to be a roll call vote.

Linda Gray took a roll call vote of the board members to go into closed session pursuant to Section 610.022, RSMo, to discuss personnel evaluation issues pursuant to Section 610.021(3)(13), RSMo.

Betty Jo Brooks	yea
T.R. Dudley	yea
Kathy Groves	yea
Earl Horsefield	yea
Joyce Jones	yea
Nancy Montgomery	yea
Tina Sooter	yea
Sarah Gallagher	yea
Mary Hughes	yea
Patrick Kelly	yea
David Miller	yea
Vicki Nelson	yea
Rick Robertson	yea
Collin Brink	yea
Bill Debo	nay
Sharon Gibson	yea
Harold Haldiman	yea
W.D. Hunter	yea
Janet Kinnett	yea
Doug Piant	yea
John Vaughn	yea
Jim Dickerson	yea

Linda stated there are:

21 yea

1 nay

Bill Debo made the objection to close the meeting, pursuant to Section 610.022.(6), RSMo, the objection is entered into the minutes on this 26th day of September 2012.

T.R. Dudley commented point of parliamentary procedure? Jim D. answered yes. T.R. Dudley asked should not the person or personnel member being discussed be allowed to be in here?

Jim D. asked if there were any objections to W.D. Hunter's wife being present during the closed meeting? There were no objections from the board members present. Jim D. stated let's see how the discussion goes, he has no objection to it but if we get to a point that we feel like there needs to be a response or something... Jim D. reminded the board members present that we are in closed session and so the items we discuss here stay here.

Joyce Jones made a motion that Jan Vaughn and Alan Galindo both be placed at 4% on the proposed salary increase. Vicki Nelson seconded the motion. Jim D. asked if there were any discussion? Nancy M. stated she thinks those two should be separate. Jim D. asked Joyce Jones if we could split it up because he wants Jan here for Alan's discussion.

Joyce Jones rescinded her former motion, and Vicki Nelson rescinded her second to the motion.

Joyce Jones made a motion to have Alan Galindo's raise percentage be at 4%. Earl Horsefield seconded the motion.

Joyce Jones asked how am I going to do this, you asked me to put it into two separate motions? Jim D. stated and it will.

Harold Haldiman made a motion to come out of closed session. T.R. Dudley seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed, motion carried. The board came out of closed session.

Jim D. asked if he has a motion. Janet Kinnett asked what was the motion needed for? Jim D. stated that if you believe that Bill D. is right, I am going to have to have a motion to rescind the boards previous approval of the first set of salary raises.

Janet Kinnett asked if we needed to have a roll call vote to come out of closed session? Jim D. stated no, not to come out, you do to go in.

Janet Kinnett made a motion to rescind the boards previous approval of the first set of salary raises. Collin Brink seconded the motion. Jim D. asked if there were any discussion?

Bill D. stated it needs two thirds majority, and Jim D. stated yes. Bill D. stated and a roll call vote.

Jim D. asked if there were any discussion? I have had a roll call requested.

Sarah Gallagher asked if before we do that could Jim D. sum up what the motion that we are rescinding was for?

Jim D. stated that the motion would rescind that first set of raises that was voted on. Sarah G. asked and that was made at the June meeting? Jim D. and several board members clarified it was at the May meeting.

Linda Gray took a roll call vote of the board members to rescind the salary raises voted on at the May 2012 meeting. Bill D. stated that this still may be paid up to this date, that is something that someone legal, like you Collin might know.

Betty Jo Brooks	yea
T.R. Dudley	yea
Kathy Groves	yea
Earl Horsefield	yea
Joyce Jones	yea
Nancy Montgomery	yea
Tina Sooter	abstain
Sarah Gallagher	yea
Mary Hughes	yea
Patrick Kelly	yea
David Miller	yea
Vicki Nelson	nay
Rick Robertson	yea
Collin Brink	yea
Bill Debo	nay
Sharon Gibson	yea
Harold Haldiman	nay

W.D. Hunter	nay
Janet Kinnett	yea
Doug Piant	abstain
John Vaughn	yea
Jim Dickerson	yea

Linda G. stated the votes were:

16 yea
4 nay
2 abstained

Jim D. stated motion carried.

Joyce Jones made a motion that Alan Galindo's salary raise increase be at 4%. T.R. Dudley seconded the motion. Jim D. asked if there were any discussion? There was no discussion. All in favor except Patrick Kelly who voted nay. Motion passed.

Joyce Jones made another motion that Jan Vaughn's salary increase percentage be at 4%. Earl Horsefield seconded. Jim D. asked if there were any discussion, but please don't get into an evaluation discussion. There was no discussion. All in favor except Nancy Montgomery and Sarah Gallagher who voted nay. Motion passed.

Earl H. asked if it would be appropriate to ask Jacque what the impact of this will be on our budget? Jim D. stated it will be at our next meeting, she is not prepared for it. The raise goes back to July 1, 2012.

Budget Committee

Collin Brink asked about the cap on the vacation hours? Jim D. stated that he wanted to run that through the personnel committee because it's really a personnel issue.

Tina Sooter said no you told us last time you wanted the full board, that is why you wanted to postpone it, that you were going to bring it up at the full board.

Jim D. stated yes well the personnel committee will discuss it and then they will come back. The board will still get a chance to vote on it, we are just going to run it by the committee at this point.

David M. reported the budget committee met. There was a brief discussion on the meeting minutes of July 25, 2012, and they were voted on and approved as written.

The monthly financials were presented by Jacque Moreland, they were reviewed and voted on and approved. I think everyone here was present during that committee meeting.

The travel policy was discussed. There was one error that was corrected and then it went on to be approved.

The special personnel committee meeting minutes were reviewed. They have since been amended and approved, and I would seek full board approval on the salary increases for the C-WIB staff based on performance.

David M. stated he would entertain a motion for that. T.R. Dudley made the motion, and Sarah Gallagher seconded the motion. Any further discussion? Hearing none we will close the motion. All in favor, none opposed, motion carries.

Chairman's Report

Jim D. reported the only thing that has not come up at any of our committee meetings that I have not discussed, we have had several complaints, apparently, that's been filed regarding the Sunshine Law issues with the Attorney General. The letter was sent to C-WIB in care of Jim Dickerson and went to Rolla. Jan and I arranged for me to get the letter. They have asked for copies of meeting notices, minutes, and things of that nature from April through August. Linda G. keeps track of that sort of thing not me, so she got that together for me and that has been sent to the person from the Attorney General's office who wrote me the letter. I have not heard anything about that since, but I needed to inform you that we are wading through that process also. We have complied as far as I know with all of their requests, and I am sure if we didn't they will be letting me know, so that's where that is right now.

David M. asked Jim D. if in his report back to the full board was he supposed to get the full board to approve those minutes? Jim D. stated no. David M. asked for the monthly financials? Jim D. stated no, only the travel policy.

Bill D. made a motion to approve the travel policy, and Joyce Jones seconded the motion. David Miller asked if there were any discussion? There was none. All in favor, none opposed, motion carries.

Mary H. asked if at the next meeting we could look at the compliance policies and make sure we are all in compliance with the Conflict of Interest form? Jim D. stated yes. Mary H. thanked him.

Nancy M. made a motion to adjourn, and T.R. D. seconded; there were no objections. The Board meeting adjourned at 2:42 p.m.