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MS. WHITMAN: The meeting will come to order, and we will start with a roll call. Region 1, Mr. Darrell Waldron?

MR. WALDRON: Present.

MS. WHITMAN: Region 2, Ms. Anne Richardson?

MS. RICHARDSON: Present.

MS. WHITMAN: Region 3, Mr. Elkton Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Here.

MS. WHITMAN: Region 4, Ms. Kim Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Here.

MS. WHITMAN: Region 4, Dr. Rodney Stapp? Region 5, Ms. Jessica James?

MS. JAMES: Here.

MS. WHITMAN: Region 5, Ms. Christine Molle?

MS. MOLLE: Present.

MS. WHITMAN: Region 6, Ms. Julia Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
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Davis-Wheeler? Region 6, Ms. Lorenda Sanchez?

MS. SANCHEZ: On the phone.

MS. CAMPBELL: Say here, present.

We're doing a new technology call here.

MR. WALDRON: So you're considered present.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, present.

MR. WALDRON: You don't take up as much space as you used to. You've really thinned down the back.

MS. SANCHEZ: Thanks, Darrell.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, really.

MR. WALDRON: Well, a good feeling and a bad feeling.

(Crosstalk)

MS. WHITMAN: Region 6, Ms. Roselyn Shirley? Hawaii, Winona Whitman, present. Oklahoma, Ms. Carla Bowlan?

MS. BOWLAN: Present.

MS. WHITMAN: Other discipline members, Mr. Jacob Bernal?

MR. BERNAL: Present.
MS. WHITMAN: Dr. David Gipp, Mr. Ryman LeBeau, Dr. David Yarlott. Good morning, everyone. And now we will have, we can have prayer? We will have a prayer at this point. Ms. Richardson?

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: We can use all the prayer we can get. Yes.

MS. RICHARDSON: Let us pray.

Father we come before thee this morning giving you thanks, honor, and glory for the beautiful day that we can meet. For the work that lies before us, we ask the Holy Spirit to answer. That you lead and guide our decisions, that we may on the path of our government and on the path of our tribes. Father, we ask that you bless Angie, that you bless us, and that you bless our government to work a miracle, and that you lead and guide us to a place that we are established. And Father, I thank you for all that will be accomplished here today, that you will bless our tribal nations in all the work that they may need. In the name of
Jesus, amen.

    MS. WHITMAN: Amen. Thank you.

    MALE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

    (Off microphone discussion)

    MS. WHITMAN: Yes, and at this
time we'd like to acknowledge a new member,
Ms. Carla Bowlan. Welcome.

    MS. BOWLAN: Thank you.

    MS. WHITMAN: Now from the
Council.

    MS. CAMPBELL: Are there any
opening remarks or any information you want to
share with us this morning?

    MS. BOWLAN: No, I don't have any
opening remarks.

    MS. CAMPBELL: Okay.

    MS. BOWLAN: I enjoyed visiting
with everybody yesterday and look forward to
working with everyone.

    MS. CAMPBELL: So they took care
of you?

    MS. BOWLAN: Yes they did.
MS. CAMPBELL: All right, all right.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: She's like old hat now.

MS. CAMPBELL: So all of that strategic planning, team building stuff worked.

MS. BOWLAN: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: All right. And I'm glad you're ready to be part of the process.

MS. WHITMAN: As discussed yesterday, at this time in the agenda we will have introductions by our T&T Contractor and Mr. James Hardin.

MR. HARDIN: Want me to go down there or?

MS. CAMPBELL: You can sit right here.

MR. HARDIN: Good morning, everybody.

MALE PARTICIPANT: Good morning.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Good morning.
MR. HARDIN: We would like to start out by saying I'd like to thank Ms. Angie Campbell for inviting us to be here today.

We are honored to be chosen and selected to perform the T&TA contract for the coming year, hopefully years. We want to talk a little bit about our capacity and we don't want to take a whole lot of your time, I know you have a lot of important things to discuss.

But my experience, I mentioned yesterday that I've been in the federal program since 1975. I've had the unique opportunity to administer and manage and Urban Indian Center that ran a large urban CETA program at the time, way back in the '70s.

Also, I've had the pleasure of running a tribal JTPA WIA program, all the changes that's came about over the years. And our program happens to be at the current level, I think the largest WIA program probably in the Southeast, Mr. Rod?
So we, back in the old days, in the '70s when there was a lot of federal money floating around, the CETA program at that time, we got a $2 million plus grant that the tribe ran in North Carolina.

My experience in managing this program has pretty much been in the arena of oversight, I know this program, I had been a project director. But our staff and our organization now has been there for 30 some years, most of them. Some of them you've met at the national conferences, regional conferences, but we have a wealth of experience, decades of experience in managing and successfully, we believe, running WIA program, JTPA program, CETA program.

I, personally, have a Masters Degree in Public Administration. I just earned that, I announced at the conference in Myrtle Beach recently, the Eastern conference, that I earned that Masters at the age of 62.

Just to tell you a little brief...
story, my last semester working on that Masters Degree I was diagnosed with cancer, had to leave school, work, and well, my school was after hours, but had to drop out and start over and get a plan to treat my cancer. But in the long story short, when I went back to start on my Masters and finish up last semester, I had lost 22 hours, someway, somehow.

So the Dean left. In the meantime, I told this story, Ms. Campbell's probably heard it before. But the Dean who promised me when I came back I could start where I left off in terms of hours.

She left the University and I found out well, that was a verbal promise that somebody didn't follow through on. But I did get to present myself to an advisory committee and they let me keep about nine hours. So I had to take about 15 or 12 or something over, so it weren't no fun.

But I endured through it and I
kind of compare it to our WIA participants, you know, you set a goal and you work towards it. And I weren't about to give up that last semester after going that far.

Long story short, my capacity and relation to this contract, I serve on boards. My Board of Directors that I work for has been as high as 20 something at one time. And my front office that I work for, my secretaries always handle the logistics in terms of their travel, arrangements, staff, all those kind of things, that kind of capacity.

I serve on other boards, the utility, electric cooperative board. We travel quite a bit in terms of training, the Board of Directors for that organization. So my capacity and experience as an administrator, and this type of contract, logistic technical assistance, we've been doing that for many, many years.

We also, in 2008, how we came to be in a position to bid on this contract and
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seek it was that in 2008, I just came back to work with the organization after being gone for three years. And under the 8(a) regulations or Small Business Administration regulations, some of you may be familiar with them, the Small Business Administration has an 8(a) small business division where companies can be classified as small, disadvantaged business, SBE type businesses, and under that SBA regulation, our organization operates as a non-profit. We are not the tribal entity.

We went after an 8(a) designation as a community development corporation and we achieved 8(a) under that. We had to establish a for-profit company that was in business for two years before we could get that designation. It took an act of Congress almost to get designated, the paperwork was unbelievable, stress was unbelievable, a lot of work. And so we finally achieved that.

So we have 8(a) status and we are currently doing business with DoD, Department of Defense.
of Defense, and we're working on some contracts in the Merlin area, Fort Bragg, we have private sector contracts for our for-profit company.

And what it's all about is creating jobs. We have contracts recent that small business in our community, any businesses will be subbing on. They create jobs, maintain jobs, those kind of things.

So our for-profit 8(a) company has the capacity to do this. Our 8(a) company is under the umbrella of our organization, it's within the same building where we exist at Central Office Headquarters.

So myself, LRDA, our WIA program, who you will meet Mr. Rod Locklear later, we will all be under the same roof and we'll be working as a team to get this contract fulfilled.

And we will, again, I guarantee you, do a quality job. I'm a stickler about details. And as you well know, attend any
conferences, if the shuttle bus don't show up on time, that's a detail that fell apart somewhere. So we believe in details and doing it.

And I've been to enough of your conferences over the years myself, William Locklear, who used to run our program, worked in that program for 30 some years. He retired in 2010.

We have a wealth of qualified people who can come in and work with us to administer this project and who knows WIA inside out, been in the program for many, many years, who will be working with us on this project. And they will be there to meet your needs any way we can, the 166 grantees as well as the 477.

So we will be there to provide anything we can under the contract, under the assignment and tasks and all those things to meet any of your needs. So at this time I'm going to let Rod or Brad go next. Which one
wants to go first? Again, thank you for allowing us to be here.

MS. WHITMAN: Thank you.

MR. LOCKLEAR: A little history.

I'm a U.S. Army veteran, I've been a farmer, teacher, coach, recruiter, and a job developer and a counselor. And I've been a trainer, a supervisor in our directive programs.

I first started out working with, well at the college, I got a B.A. and I taught U.S. History for a couple of years and then I went to work with a program called the North Carolina Fund, which was a forerunner to the war on poverty.

The North Carolina Fund got a $15 million grant from the Ford Foundation and started working with about 12, 15 community action agencies within the state of North Carolina doing community to organization. And then when the EEO office came into be and how to make the office of Economic Opportunity, as a result of those 15 programs and over a
period of five years, we brought in about $153 million into the state. And at that time we were doing community organizations, some Manpower training programs and stuff like that.

The first project I worked at, it was funded by the Department of Labor and is called Labor Mobility Project. We were trying to change migrational patterns from kids jumping on the train, coming to Washington, going to Philadelphia, and going to New York, and keeping them within the state of North Carolina by relocating them to the urban areas, to jobs in the state.

After that I went to work for the U.S. Government as a vested program manager out in the, well, Seattle Regional Office. So I worked in the Seattle Regional Office a couple of years. I've worked in Alaska, Washington, Idaho, and the state of Oregon.

Then I came back and directed a Manpower Training Program, well, directed a
comprehensive Set Program in the seven county
area within the state of North Carolina. And
after two years I came to work here in D.C.

I worked with the Department of
Health and Human Services, working in the
social and rehabilitation services, which was
the welfare program, Medicaid program,
rehabilitation program. Then it later became,
they created an organization called Healthcare
Financing Administration, where they merged
the Medicare program and Medicaid program.
And we moved over to Baltimore from this
complex over here for the HEWs, well, where
HHS is located today.

I worked in the Office of Field
Operations, working with the regional offices
across the country for a period of 18 years.
And that's since we worked out of the
administrator's office. We took and managed,
didn't manage, but we monitored the activities
of those regional offices and reported back in
to him.
And in Central Office, of course we attended the major program component's staff meetings and took their policy directions and stuff, and took that opportunity as well and worked closely with the regional administrator and his staff.

After 18 to 19 years in that office, I then shifted over to the Equal Employment Opportunity Office. And there we did training for 4,000 staff members. We changed the name of the agency from Healthcare Financing Administration to the Office of, well, it became the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. That program spends in excess of about $600 billion in health field across the country.

In there we did all of the civil rights training, Title 6 training, we did the Title 7 training, and we offered about nine courses during that time.

In the year 2010, I decided, well Mr. William had retired from the Office of the
WIA program there at LRDA. And it was at that point in time I decided to retire from the federal government and went back to the North Carolina area and became Director of the WIA program.

So overall, when I look back at my history, work history, I've got about 16 years directly involved in Manpower Training Programs. I've got experience working as a volunteer, doing training, managing contracts, so I've got a wealth of experience.

I won't tell you my age, I am in excess of 39. But I'm a workaholic. People ask me why don't you retire? And I say I will, when I die. It's just me. So that's who I am.

MALE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

MS. WHITMAN: Thank you, sir.

MR. WALDRON: You got a hard act to follow, Brad.

MS. CAMPBELL: He's one of the young ones.
MR. HARRIS: Yes. Good morning.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Good morning.

MR. HARRIS: It's great to be here. Following up on Mr. Hardin and Mr. Rod's acts a little tough so I'm going to be short and sweet. I am the President of LED, which is the 8(a) company.

And like Mr. Hardin said, we have been in business for over four years, going on five. And we currently have contracts with the DoD, and have current jobs going on at Fort Bragg and Robins Air Force Base. And we are looking at actually doing some work here in the Maryland area with GSA, and have a pending project at Andrews Air Force Base as well, which is close by.

LED basically has an operation that incorporates a lot of different intel. We do facility maintenance work. We also handle property management, asset management. We do income tax assessments for different housing projects for LRDA. And we basically
handle all that in one office as it stands right now.

Again, as I told you yesterday, my background, I have a BSc, civil engineering degree from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. So I qualify in that aspect, have had projects of excess of, that I've managed, of upwards of $5 to $10 million. And have estimated projects of upwards of $30 to $50 million with the Department of Transportation for North Carolina and South Carolina.

We really are looking forward to doing a great job for the Department of Labor and the DINAP. And we hope to, we hope you guys will see that. And we look forward to handling this project.

I've got two experienced gentlemen behind me here who I will continue to rely on like I do on a daily basis for advice and guidance. And just hope I don't get as gray as they are, on a quick note there. But
anyway, it's great to be here. We're glad that you invited us. And we hope to do a great job. Thank you.

MS. WHITMAN: Thank you.

MS. CAMPBELL: Thank you, guys. I also provided some additional information because securing a contract, whether it be 8(a) or regular contract, is a long process. We started this process, when I say we, myself and Mike Delaney, because he will be the core for the contract. It's taken us almost five months to put this in place.

And I did provide some additional information. It's in your package. But more importantly, I do want to direct the Council's attention before we move on in terms of how the selection was made. It wasn't made sporadically, for lack of a better word. It was made with a lot of evaluation.

We did compare five 8(a) firms. If you can see across the board, we have to ask and solicit, and Mike can tell you it
takes literally weeks of investigating. We actually looked at one, two, three, four, five, I'm sorry, six entities.

And as you can see, across the board, the Lumbee Regional was the one that met all of the standards for the Department of Labor. And then we still went in and those that additionally met the criteria, we went and did even more further investigations.

This is on the agenda for tomorrow morning, for specific questions that you have. We also provided really, the market analysis because we did a full market analysis against all six of these entities. They were all tribally owned. They all met with the exception of one, the 8(a) status. And we did per regulation, went, saw, and obtained an Indian-owned organization.

Also, too, we are providing the statement of need that we work with them on. For your reference, as you can see, we did not formally present the statement of need to the
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Council. And I made that decision not to do that. Normally under the grant, when we used to operate the grant, I would come forward and get recommendations from the Council.

But in the interest of this committee and the community, to put the moneys in a contract, I made the decision to go forward, to go ahead and secure the contract so we can continue to conduct business, we could have the peer to peer, we could do the conferences, et cetera.

It is a one year contract so that would afford us an opportunity as a committee to discuss, not so much the amount that would go into a contract, because the Department has decided across the board that all funding, specifically those Section 166, one percent, will go into a contract.

It provides transparency and accountability of funds. It's something, too, that I guess the Council has talked about and so it is on the agenda for tomorrow if there's
additional questions. But please, if you take the opportunity, take a look, this is the official statement of work. These are the deliverables that we will work with Lumbee on. And of course it's a one year optional, so we'll take a look and have a better idea in terms of if it's meeting our needs next year.

Okay, and with that, I just wanted for you all, I know Jessica yesterday had asked, excuse me, Councilwoman Jessica James had asked for an update or some background information on our new contractor. So I wanted to provide the Council with that information. And tomorrow, if we have time this afternoon you can ask additional questions.

So the next item, and we are pretty much on task, is the election of the Vice Chair. When I walked in this morning, we're not going to go through the process. We have one nominee for the Vice Chair. And that is Winona Whitman.
So now we will formally, I'm not going to break and do all of that so we'll formally, you can't nominate yourself. I need to receive whoever put one of these ballots into the box, a formal --

MS. MOLLE: I nominate Winona Whitman as Vice Chair.

MR. WALDRON: Second.

MS. CAMPBELL: All in favor?

MALE PARTICIPANT: Aye.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Aye.

MS. CAMPBELL: And any opposed, opposition? Okay, so for the record, Winona?

MS. WHITMAN: Mahalo nui loa, thank you very much Council members for the honor and the confidence, mahalo.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, now we got the logistics out of the way, we can go ahead and take a look and continue on our strategic planning session. And I know yesterday, where we left off, before we start, normally I don't take as an active role in facilitating a
process. But for the next, at least today, because we have approximately about what, one, two, three, four, five, about five hours to accomplish some tasks.

So in those five hours, I'm going to, as the designated federal officer, really serve more as a facilitator of the process so that we can get some objectives identified and some deliverables in place.

Kim Carroll had the experience in working with me when we did the 477 in two days. We did what the White House said was impossible. And I think we could do the same thing here.

So having said that, I know that we left off yesterday looking at the Our Story. And this was a number one priority. So I want to take a look at that.

And then also, too, as a group, realistically try to get through the top three points. That means we'd have about an hour, an hour and a half if that on each item.
So first and foremost it would be the Our Story project, the goal, what I want to see is, there was also a recommendation yesterday from Mr. Bernal that we develop a one or two pager report, how we're going to address that as a committee, are we going to do it here?

We do have a Power Point, laptop, everything available if we want to do that. Are we going to propose it as a resolution for follow up and then we would follow up closely. But I know that there was, at least I heard, an urgency to get that information. So we could work on that.

And then turn around, if that's possible, and then, you know, really identify some of the action items that need to happen. I know Jessica really captured a lot of them so we have the information, we can just sort of concur with it, vote on it, I could have Mike put it in this template, write it up, and then we would have it for follow-up as a
group.

And then we can move on to the second item, and I also thought that it was important that we do take time, especially this afternoon, to identify what type of presentation, what information that we want to share with the Assistant Secretary tomorrow, and is there a strategy that we want to develop, you know, with her to identify specifically what items we want to talk to her about?

As the designated federal office and the Chief of the DINAP program, I'm responsible for back briefing her before, of course, she meets with any Council or any group of individual, stakeholders, and so that's what I'll be tasked to do this afternoon before we actually go live with her tomorrow morning, okay? So having said that, we are going to start the Our Story. And Winona is also actually going to help me process that.
MR. WALDRON: Can I just break
apart for just one second, sorry.

MS. CAMPBELL: Please, please, Mr. Waldron.

MR. WALDRON: Just to thank CMIC
for all the work that they did carrying the T&TA forward for everybody and, you know, that organization over-performed for years and then helped us for a very, very long time through a lot of things.

I don't know if we can give them a personal letter from the Council or a professional letter of commendation to CIMC for their service. And I'm sure we will continue to be drawing on them for information.

MS. RICHARDSON: I agree.

MS. WHITMAN: Is that a motion that you're making?

MR. WALDRON: Yes.

MS. RICHARDSON: I second.

MS. WHITMAN: Okay, seconded by
Councilwoman Richardson.

MS. CAMPBELL: And that's going to be my first action item.

MR. WALDRON: Thank you, Lorenda.

MS. CAMPBELL: The Department of Labor will be tasked with that, to write a letter. And I won't, no, because I'll write the letter and then we will have a senior member from the Department have it signed and sent to CIMC.

MR. WALDRON: Okay, thank you.

MS. CAMPBELL: You're welcome, thank you.

MS. WHITMAN: Thank you for the motion.

MS. SANCHEZ: Thank you.

MR. WALDRON: Yes, you're welcome.

MS. CAMPBELL: And the target due date will be by December of this year. Well actually it has to be before then, possibly. No, it will be December because it will, by December.
MR. WALDRON: Thanks.

MS. CAMPBELL: We won't have the turnover until January.

MR. WALDRON: Our Story.

MS. WHITMAN: All right, do we have a format to be working with? Angie, did you submit the format? I mean we have the outline, defined purpose, identify task --

MS. CAMPBELL: Well yesterday we did receive these, I think this is a really excellent place to start. And that is the items that have already been done, that Jessica James had made available. And then we have, oh these are the transition.

So in terms of Our Story, this is a really good place to start in terms of deliverables. If you don't have it just let me know. It's Our Story research workgroup presentation. Here you go, I'll share.

But more importantly, as a group, I'd like for us to decide whether or not, because I think we were in agreement
yesterday, do we, because I know that Dr. Stapp, he's not here this morning, wanted us to work cohesively as a group, which is fine. We're going with that premise. We could take the time this morning, at least an hour or so to pull together a one or two pager, at least a draft format.

We do have the capacity here to put it upon the sheet, maybe take about, on the break, in 15 minutes, come back at 10:00, work on it really until 11:00. If we can get a good workable, agreeable one or two pages and then be able to, actually as a committee, decide or pass a resolution that we could task it to a specific individual, one to finalize it. We'll come back, and then also confer that Mr. Jacobs, who, or Mr. Bernal, I'm going to call you Jacob. I'm trying to get used to that stuff, we can also decide at that time because he has agreed, and during the last Council meeting to be an advocate for us. And so that would be another motion that we could
put forward to actually, and then it's up to the Council.

But that was the strategy that the Department would like for you all to consider. But specifically, is that workable? Any comments before we go forward?

All right, so we're going to work on a one or two pager for about an hour, right? So why don't we take, Dawn, we have some coffee, get the coffee coming down?

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: We want to do that, get some coffee.

MS. WHITMAN: Are we taking a five minute, ten minute break?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. We can come back and start right at the top of the hour at 10:00, get some coffee, you know, because that's really what we were planning to do. We could take this time instead of conducting the election, take a quick break, we'll get set up visually and then spend an hour really pulling
together the one or two pages, at least everyone would have an idea of what's being presented.

For example, I know, I'm thinking about participant numbers and funding numbers. We'll get on the line and have, if we could, Duane Hall email us that information so we could have it and import it if we need to. He could text it to me so we'll have that as well.

That's what you're going to need, right, Mr. Bernal, participant numbers, funding numbers, and then from there we could work the document. And we have the screen here so we all can visually see it. Is that agreeable? Is that a good plan? I'm looking at everyone to --

MALE PARTICIPANT: Good, sounds good.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: Mr. Bernal?

MR. BERNAL: Well, I think it's
important to get some background, some
historical perspective. In the meeting in
Louisiana I asked a specific question related
to the decrease in funding. It was, does the
Council have a legislative agenda, any type of
actions, I'm sorry, getting some buzzes from,
in terms of a background at the Louisiana
meeting, we discussed briefly the recent cuts.
Is it buzzing for you too?

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MR. BERNAL: I'm hearing buzzing
up here, okay. A few minutes were given to
the topic of the recent reductions in funding
that took effect this past July. And I asked
the question, was there any effort from this
Council in terms of a legislative agenda to
promote the program, to talk to Congress,
specifically to appropriations in a advocacy
education mode.

And the response I got was no. So
I suggested at that time that the Council
consider a education committee, as a group,
that we can approach Congress, specifically appropriations so this doesn't happen again.

Now there's no guarantee that we're not going to face that fiscal cliff July 1st, excuse me, January 1st. But that was the thinking, is that if we had some promotional materials, we could all work together to educate Congress, the importance of the program, the great track record, and that please, please, not just keep us at the same level but strongly consider upping our funding. So that's important.

I don't want to take away from the Our Story project, it has nothing to do with that. It's just, can we take some elements and tell Our Story briefly, like a position paper or white paper, so I could have something to go to Congress that by the way, it's just not me alone.

I firmly believe that all, I hope it's okay to say this, politics is local, so really going to be incumbent, the
responsibility of the income that all of us to
get involved in this endeavor to promote to
Congress the importance of this program, the
sustainability, and hopefully increase
funding. So that's just, in terms of a
background, that's where I was coming from
beginning in Louisiana.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman
Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: And I do recall
that. And as I recall, we did develop a
workgroup and I noticed on this handout that
we received from Theresa, it has a copy of
that, has it identified as Outreach.

MR. BERNAL: Outreach Subcommittee
I think it is called.

MS. CARROLL: Right. There's like
one, two, three, four, five of us that have
been assigned to that. I think this is a
great starting place. I don't want to lose

And, you know, looking at the
obstacles there that, particularly the funding that we're facing with that, my suggestion would be that we develop it in stages and perhaps address one stage per year or however long it takes.

And my thoughts we be of the first stage, would be this historical information that we probably already have, as well as the development of the two page outreach document.

Perhaps the second stage would then be more of the interviewing, the talking to the individuals that we had discussed before, I think that's a wonderful idea.

And then perhaps the third stage would be the development of, or the production of the materials, the DBD and the Nice found book, of however we want to do that, which would give us an opportunity to at least have something to show, something to move forward with, but without losing site of what our ultimate goal, what that Our Story project is.

MS. CAMPBELL: So I'm hearing, why
wouldn't it be called the Our Story, the outcome, we were going to do something here in the second part, I can get the other two, it will literally be Our Story, so they're not actually the same. One will set the stage for some of this to be incorporated here, but this is separate.

MR. WALDRON: I'd just like to add that the ending objective of Our Story is to show the impact that this program has had in Indian country with the participants whom performed outstanding and really went on to make a difference in their communities. And Thomas Dowd is one, became a Deputy Assistant Secretary.

And I'm sure there are many Chiefs out there who got their start with this program and now are head of multi-million dollar gaming institutions and businesses. So I think it's important that we show the results in the impact in Indian country because at one time during the negotiations
for funds for our community, we were looking at impact studies.

We were determined to be unimpactable. And there wasn't enough of us to get enough money for the side for it. So I think it's important that the end result of this shows the impact that this program has had in Indian communities.

MS. WHITMAN: Other comments?

Councilwoman James.

MS. JAMES: Yes, so, so far I have goals of increasing funding levels and impact of WIA funds, funding results. That's what I have in my notes so far.

MS. WHITMAN: I think we had, number three was a production.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: For this we'll actually be, we're going to take about an hour for the work on this, right, get something down. While we're taking a break we'll queue up, make sure we have the Power Point ready
and ready to type, ready, Mike? I'm ready.

And then we'll go in and really
get some deliverables, to actually put them
together for the Our Story and then, we'll
just get that far and then we'll cross the
next bridge when we get to it, all right?
Okay, well with that, let's take --

MS. WHITMAN: Ten minute break.

MS. CAMPBELL: -- ten minutes.
The coffee will be ready in ten minutes so
just want to stretch or do you just want to go
on until the coffee gets here, what do you
think?

MR. WALDRON: Go on until the
coffee gets here.

MS. CAMPBELL: All right, we're
going to work until the coffee gets here.
Who's laptop is that?

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: So Craig, can you
keep for the action, actually like the
deliverables?
MR. LEWIS: Yes, that's fine.

MS. CAMPBELL: All right, so how are we going to start this? Maybe we should do like a, I'm sorry, how do we want to start tackling this monster?

MR. WALDRON: Start with the beginning.

MS. CAMPBELL: That's what we're going to do so we're going to want to get an intro, right, then the body and then the summary, right?

MR. WALDRON: More on the intent of the lost?

MS. CAMPBELL: What do you want in the end?

MS. SANCHEZ: Yes, we want to begin with the foundation of the program, which is tribal sovereignty and self-determination.

MR. WALDRON: Right.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, so really the premise of them all, we want to state them
all.

MS. SANCHEZ: Winona?

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, Lorenda?

MS. SANCHEZ: You wouldn't have an iPad or a laptop there?

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, yes we do.

MS. SANCHEZ: What I'd like to email to you is the considerations for the INA listening session on the WIA reauthorization. I think it's the last time that we actually did a outreach to the grantee community. And we had asked three questions. One was what has worked under provisions of the current legislation, what needs to be improved or changed, and what opportunities exist for innovation, presented by WIA reauthorization.

Each major provision of the act, the purpose, the program authorized the administrative provision, the plan, the appropriations, and there's a piece that was on the consolidation, which addressed the 477.

I think there's background
information that comes from support from the grantee community on just the core principles of WIA for Indian and Native American Programs.

So I can email that to someone and then, you know, we can extract from that to also consider in our strategic plan. Because I think we need to recognize the input that we got from the grantee community on the direction of this program.

MS. WHITMAN: Lorenda, is that the one that is on the Council Web site that's on N-I-N-E-E-2-C?

MS. SANCHEZ: It may be, but it's December 10th of 2009. I can email it to someone. I just need to know who I can send it to.

MS. WHITMAN: Because I'm sure it's on the Web site. I thought I had seen it --

MS. SANCHEZ: It should be.

MS. WHITMAN: -- last night. I
was looking at the Web site.

MS. CAMPBELL: Send it to the distribution list, to all the Council. And that way we have that information, you know, Carol could pick it up.

MR. WALDRON: Every individual has to have a password for the Wi-Fi so, they'll give one, right?

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. SANCHEZ: So I can forward it to someone if you have a laptop.

MS. WHITMAN: Okay.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, but in the interest of time because we do have the logistical shortcomings of internet access --

MR. LEWIS: And only one person can have access.

MS. WHITMAN: Oh, is that right?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, and so people really need to shut down.

MS. WHITMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. CAMPBELL: We have to wait
until somebody gets set up.

    MS. WHITMAN: Oh, okay.

    MR. LEWIS: Or unless somebody wants to serve as the conduit, I mean --

    MS. WHITMAN: Oh, I see.

    MS. CAMPBELL: And this is the perfect item where, well Craig brought this up yesterday and the life of me, I never thought about it, I don't know how we functioned without one, without a secretary or a recorder for this Council, Craig had brought that up yesterday.

    And one of the areas we're going to try to include it is in an upcoming charter to behoove that, to have a Chair, Vice Chair, and then a Recorder, someone who we can communicate on the deliverables.

    But until we can get that information faxed, let's go ahead, or received, where we can take it and implement it. Because it would be really neat to take it and cut and paste it. But in the interest
of time so we can keep going forward, let's
stay here, if that's okay, all right?

We've got to pull together an
introduction, which of course is going to
include the 166 Law, we're going to
specifically state that. What else do we want
to state up front? You have the most
experience, Mr. Bernal in terms of what you're
saying.

MR. BERNAL: What's your story,
what's the ask?

MS. CAMPBELL: What's the ask?

What is the ask?

MR. BERNAL: That it continues.

MS. CAMPBELL: What's the ask?

Tell me, what's the ask. What are we asking
Congress. I know what I'm asking.

MR. WALDRON: More money.

MS. CAMPBELL: Additional, all
right, more money, additional funding?

MR. WALDRON: We want to continue
the success we've had so we can have a greater
and stronger impact on our native community.

I think that one of the meetings we had, it said there was like 185 million, who was the gentleman that came, it was in this building, the last time we met here. He came and was telling us what the original budget was when the program first started.

MR. BERNAL: Dr. Eddie Brown?

MR. WALDRON: Was it who?

MR. BERNAL: Dr. Brown?

MR. WALDRON: No.

MALE PARTICIPANT: It was from --

MS. SANCHEZ: It was Pete Homer.

MR. WALDRON: Oh, Pete Homer.

MS. CAMPBELL: This minimally is what the statute says. This is what the statute says, --

MR. WALDRON: It would be nice to get back to that, right?

MS. CAMPBELL: For 47 if you divide, if you get minimal, you get what the law says we should get is progress. We're not
asking for anything that they decided more, that might be a good place to start here.

MR. WALDRON: Well, I don't know if it's stopped but they put it in the beginning someplace, you know, and maybe the other one is how many people has really served and helped?

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, so what's the ask? We're going to say this is the program, this is what we're asking for. What do we hope to accomplish by having someone, you know, hear this paper. What do we want from them? And then we justify why we're asking for this.

That's what I'm thinking in terms of the process, I don't know, Mr. Bernal, we need your help. What else do you want out of this process? And why do we need it? That would come justification, so that's all we want is demand the maintenance, demand to maintain the funding?

MR. WALDRON: I would say more
programs designed like this one in Indian country.

MS. CAMPBELL: More?

MR. WALDRON: More programs designed with Indians in charge for Indians.

MS. CAMPBELL: Under 166?

MR. WALDRON: No, other departments.

MS. CAMPBELL: Every department, every federal agency has an Indian and Native American office.

MR. WALDRON: Is it as successful as this one?

MS. CAMPBELL: I don't know, I don't know. I couldn't say.

MS. MOLLE: I think we need to focus on this one for this white page.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. And I was going to say very careful, it's called duplication of services, duplication of services.

MS. CARROLL: Well, I mean, are we
really using this to ask for something? Or
are we really using this to introduce
ourselves and to benefit Congress as to who we
are and why our program is important? I mean
yes, there are a lot of things we could ask
for but I didn't think that was the purpose of
this.

MR. WALDRON: At this occasion we
define the purpose, don't we?

MS. CAMPBELL: I'm just trying to,
so it's up to you all, I mean this is your --

MR. WALDRON: Tell our story.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. RICHARDSON: I agree that's
the purpose is to tell our story.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well it can be
both. I mean you can ask for something and
the justification, state why it's justifiable.
It's really in the eye, I think that's one
approach, is that this is what we're seeking
and this is why we're seeking it. And the
justification would be the story, this is what
we produce, this is what we've done.

MS. CARROLL: I think it's important to point out that the law does state a minimum of $55 million, and show how our funding has been less than that over the years. I think that's an important point to make.

MS. CAMPBELL: That's a good point.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, and that we've existed at a minimum mandated funding of $55 million, however, we've only been funded for, here's our track record of funding and we've still been successful.

MS. CARROLL: And we've persevered.

MR. RICHARDSON: Right.

MR. WALDRON: The law is not being enforced. It's in the law and the law's the law.

MS. MOLLE: I believe that in the first statement, that we should give the...
education that we are not duplicating services. This is a successful program that does not duplicate services that WIA state programs provide. I think we need to show that right up front.

And then, you know, talk about the successes of the program. I don't know if we can get some numbers together on how many people we have served, how many people we have impacted.

MS. CAMPBELL: How many years?

MS. MOLLE: Forty years.

MS. CAMPBELL: How many years, 40?

MS. MOLLE: It's been at least 40 years.

MR. WALDRON: Yes, more than that.

MS. MOLLE: Yes, Manpower, CETA, JTPA, and WIA.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well I don't think we can pull together 40 years --

MS. MOLLE: No but I'm just saying that is how long it's been.
MS. CAMPBELL: Yes but we're supposed to be able to at least start, all we need to state and then --

MS. MOLLE: But I think they want to know about, like you said, the duplication. Because the letters, I did get a few letters back from a couple Senators. And they talked about duplication and collaboration with the state, you know, and all that. They didn't care anything about the sovereignty piece or any of that.

So I think that's the point, that's where we need to get their attention that this is not a program that is duplicating the state WIA programs.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well, you know, there's one careful item I want to say here. Just because we're not duplicating it there's no need to say it, and because I participated in part. And to date, 477 passed their part, 166 is past the part, and so has the Bureau or its comparable program which was the TWEP
program that I was parted on.

And simply stating that we're not

a duplication of service, we don't have to

justify it because according to their own

records we're not. So if we say we're not a
duplication of service then they may say, well

why are you saying that? And they may even

solicit, it's just a thought, well probably

not because we're not doing that anymore, but

that's just from a, more of a program manager

perspective, because that's what you want to

present.

MR. RICHARDSON: But I think the

idea is --

MS. MOLLE: And that statement,

that where we are today --

MS. CAMPBELL: Maybe not
duplication --

MS. MOLLE: -- we're beyond that.

MS. CAMPBELL: Maybe a unique

service provider?

MR. RICHARDSON: That's right.
And that's the thing. There's a perception that the Indian, Native American guide program is a duplicate of service of other state run programs yet, I mean, it's incumbent on us to tell the story of yes, we have this 40 year history of successfully providing unique, or of services to meet the unique need of Indian tribes and communities, right, that were previously unmet by the existing programs. I mean, I think that's the way that, you know, we're able to state that we're not a duplicate. We're not just another program, a silo program.

MS. CAMPBELL: So, so far the point we're going to state, for example, so this is the law that governs this program, this is what the statute says. It says that minimally, we're to be funded this amount. And this is what makes us so unique. This is what up-front justifies not just by law, but why we should get this money. This is what makes us unique. That's going to be our
opening statement, correct? Yes? So my question is to you, so what makes you so unique from the TWEP program?

MR. WALDRON: It's in our accomplishments.

MS. RICHARDSON: I think that one of the things that Elkton was just saying is that we are a unique service provider serving a specially targeted population whose need had been previously unmet.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes what I mean, this is not a personal attack. I want to be a devil's advocate because a lot of time I've got to prove this information through the Solicitor's Office and stuff like that. So I know how they're going to, not specifically, but if you all can help me as well.

We are unique, right? Unique service provider in that you provide the services for to Indian and Native Americans. So does TWEP. So does, under TANF it's called what, Tribal Work Experiences.
So does, and actually the one that they're putting forward is actually the 477 concept. That's more comprehensive in a wrap-around. And I'm not saying that in an negative way, I'm just saying it so that when we say unique, but what specifically makes it unique? We always said it's in statutes, well we know that, but --

MR. WALDRON: Our success rate with our communities, with our --

MR. RICHARDSON: Success rate, also the ability of this program to serve Indians regardless of whether they live on or off reservation, that's unique.

MR. WALDRON: That's unique.

MS. CAMPBELL: That's good. And now that's unique.

MR. RICHARDSON: And that's direct funding and presence to Indian communities regardless of where they exist.

MS. WHITMAN: Well also, at this point, can I just interject what was brought
up earlier about the, because the Council had worked on this, the considerations for the INE listening session. So accessed it on the INE Community Page, the Council's Web site, and I happen to have a copy. So anyway, Michael is going to make copies because it highlights, we did reference to the law about funding and all the other needs. So I just wanted to interject that.

MS. CAMPBELL: You know, and I don't know if the key is, is if we could get that pulled up on a, because Mike doesn't have access to the internet there, right? So we're going to have to have it downloaded on a pin drive so we can have it cut and pasted in.

MS. WHITMAN: And why is it we, I mean, why can't we all access it at the same time?

MS. CAMPBELL: I don't know. I think that we're lucky to have access.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. BOWLAN: Can I make a comment?
I don't know you all's specifics but I know the Tom Coburn Reports, that of the different issued services, somehow we need to address those things in there in that report. Somehow, to show that we're not a duplication of services because I know that Indian and Native American Programs was in that report specifically.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Is Colburn, C-O-L-B?

MS. BOWLAN: No, Coburn, C-O-B-U-R-N, Tom, Tom Coburn, C-O-B-U-R-N. He's the one that did one of those reports.

MS. WHITMAN: Well and also, I forget the year, but I did a response to the Secretary of Labor, it was that GAO report that had indicated that, you know, where they were trying to move us to the state program and they had indicated that, you know, we were a duplication of program, you know, services. So that's another area that ought to be addressed.
MS. CAMPBELL: So right now we are, is the coffee made yet?

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, let's have coffee. And at least we have our initial thought down, what we're going to present. And while we're having coffee, think, is there anything else that we want to state in one or two pages up front? What is our, what do we want to say, you know, that of course we all know, right, that first paragraph may be the only paragraph they even entertain. So it has to be precise.

And then we go into the body, to really have concrete information like this is the only, in the federal government, not the only one, but part of the only one that has appropriations that actually fund on and off reservations. That is, so think about some of those real unique qualities that we want to reinforce, okay? Like if we state the population of urbans that live off
reservations and that.

    MS. MOLLE: And the number of
different tribes that we serve. I know our
organization alone serves 92 different tribes.

    MS. CAMPBELL: And of course, we
can bring figures up all day but we better
have some backup. Let me see if I don't have
footnotes going here, we're going to make it
easy. We can say the total population off
reservation is 70 percent, okay, well what's
our citation?

    MS. WHITMAN: Right, we're going
to have to have a reference.

    MS. CAMPBELL: All right? We'll
get as much as possible down. So we've made
progress in 20 minutes. So let's have some
coffee, take about ten minutes, and then we'll
come back and gauge where we're at at 11:00.

    (Whereupon, the meeting in the
above-mentioned matter went off the record at
10:11 a.m. and went back on the record at
10:33 a.m.)
MS. CAMPBELL: We're back on the record. We're back in session. And what we're doing real quick is Mike's trying to queue up so we can cut and paste as much of the 166 law and information in. Craig is capturing our action plan. Right now, in terms of people who are going to help us accomplish this task is Craig, Kim Carroll, I heard you say your name, right?

MS. CARROLL: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: And Mr. Bernal, Jacob. And who else was on that list?

MALE PARTICIPANT: Shirley.

MS. CAMPBELL: Roselyn Shirley.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Patrick Andrew.

MS. CAMPBELL: Patrick is not a member. Okay, so we'll start with what we have, those three. And any other, we need one more person. And Darrell Waldron, okay, that will be the start. Not that we won't report back out, but at least we'll know who is going
to follow up on this.

So we have our introduction down pretty well. Mike, when you have the chance could you cut and paste and put it up on the screen, you know, the document that Lorenda just sent?

MR. DELANEY: Yes, she sent two of them.

MS. CAMPBELL: So I think that, how much of this under the considerations for the listening session, we could cut and paste them, I'm thinking in the intro --

MR. DELANEY: -- considerations.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, I think it would be one, yes, at least one, right before, and that would be an introduction.

MR. DELANEY: And this is one I believe that we handed out to everyone?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. That's going to be the first introduction statement and then also too, state the law that, the $55 million, I think that in here somewhere, too.
where's that at?

    MS. WHITMAN: That's on Page 3.

    MS. CAMPBELL: Page 3, what number?

    MR. WALDRON: 3 of 5?

    MS. WHITMAN: Yes, Number 7.

    MS. CAMPBELL: Number 7, yes. Cut and paste that in there too, Mike, that says, and we can all be reworded but at least we have the thought down, right?

    So we're going to state the law. And also too, we don't have to stay at $55 million. We can make a statement that minimally that's what's in the law. But we can always advocate.

    MR. WALDRON: Seventy-five would be nice, we were promised that.

    MR. RICHARDSON: But I think, you know, if we're going to in this document, advocate for a higher amount of funding, I think we're going to need to provide some re-statements about why we need that level of
requested funding, such as if we request $100 million, you know, we would want to say, with this level of funding, these are the levels and types of outcomes in which we can accomplish.

And if we needed to, we could revert back to days of when funding levels were higher and these types and levels of outcomes were attained with higher levels of funding. Of course, you know, you'll have to transcribe that to today's cost of living and, you know, cost of doing business.

MS. CARROLL: I recall several years ago Norm DeWeaver had made the statement that if the authorized amount of funding had not changed, that over the years the specific cost of living, minimum wage went up, you know, then of course the cost of everything. And so if you look at it that way, it's as if we received a 50 percent decrease.

MS. RICHARDSON: Population increase, training costs --
MS. SANCHEZ: There is a recommendation that was on the updated summaries that Theresa had sent out. It was on Page 3 of the updated summary, where we respectfully requested the Department budget, request to be increased beyond the minimum funding level of $55 million.

MS. CAMPBELL: Lorenda, which document are you working with?

MS. SANCHEZ: That was the one that was sent out with the group lists, and it had the transition update. Everybody should have got that within the first email that Theresa sent out.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. SANCHEZ: And we put in there that in light of the cost of doing business and the tremendous unmet need of our jobless population and all native use, the INA program should be funded at no less than $100 million annually.

MS. WHITMAN: Does everybody have
it? Because it was sent to all the Council
members. It looks like this.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. SANCHEZ: Do you need that
sent again?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, send it to

Mike Delaney, Lorenda, please so we can cut
and paste.

MR. WALDRON: Did you hear that,
send it to Mike Delaney?

MS. SANCHEZ: All right.

MS. CAMPBELL: All right, so we
have the statement and the law cut and paste
in there. And we can always simplify it. And
then we have statement in there about the $55
million and why, Mike's going to include a
statement why that there's a need for
minimally of $55 million. And then that would
all go into the introduction, right? You got
that, Mike?

MR. WALDRON: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: That's all under
the introduction, right?

MR. WALDRON: I think the introduction's getting kind of long.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, that's fine because we'll just practice later. At least we have the idea down.

MR. BERNAL: I have a quick question. Under the CETA, the INA listening session, it does say $100 million. So what's the pleasure of the Council? Is it $100 million or $55 million, or have you made that decision?

MS. WHITMAN: $55 million is the minimum.

MR. BERNAL: That we ask the --

MS. CAMPBELL: You want to ask?

That's the question, do we ask?

MR. WALDRON: I'd ask for it.

MS. WHITMAN: What is it?

MALE PARTICIPANT: All they can do is send you back to 55.

MS. CAMPBELL: Ask for the 100
because the law says minimally it's this --

MR. BERNAL: And then the justification is thought out.

MS. CAMPBELL: -- we're pointing with that. Right, and the justification that we would like.

MR. BERNAL: Okay, thanks.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Good question.

MR. WALDRON: We could really get to the briefs.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, did you get that Mike? And I put admin costs, I have population, cost of living, okay. What else do we have?

MS. WHITMAN: Minimum wage.

MS. CAMPBELL: What else do we have?

MS. WHITMAN: Minimum wage increase.

MS. CAMPBELL: All right. So, Mike, what do we have so far? So in our
introduction --

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: Then you guys can cut and paste the verbage, right? Is this clear as mud or what do you think?

MALE PARTICIPANT: I thought we were going to cut and paste this.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, Mike, you were supposed to cut and paste the whole section.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: While he beautifies it, what we could do here, right, because you've got those statements and also the second statement you have to get off of Page 3 of 5, cut and paste this one. It has to do with what we want.

So while Mike does the introduction, now we're on the body. Which would be, you have why we need $100 million, that's because of that population increase. this is the statement of need, right, the why, right? Why do we need this money, that's a
statement of need, right?

MS. MOLLE: And we should also
state the unemployment rate, poverty rates, I
don't know if we have them but --

MR. RICHARDSON: Well one thing

that might be important is to show or to state

that the initial amount that was mandated at

$55 million, at the time that was initially

mandated, unemployment, living in poverty,

educational attainment levels in the Indian

communities were this much.

MR. WALDRON: Good point.

MR. RICHARDSON: And that was an

underfunded amount to address those. However

now, the poverty levels, Indian unemployment,

educational attainment levels, are here, you

know? And, you know, funding has decreased,

you know.

MS. RICHARDSON: And we haven't

had the $55 million in --

MR. RICHARDSON: That's right,

funding has decreased and, you know, to
maintain even the levels of goals, you know, that were funded originally at $55 million, we would need this level, today's funding.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, so in the statement, we have our introduction so now we're turning to the statement of need, really would be the body, right, of it?

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Richardson?

MS. RICHARDSON: In talking about the statement of need, I kind of thought that, you know, a part of this preference on the law would be to talk about the uniqueness of this program first.

MS. CAMPBELL: You guys can formalize it.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, to the uniqueness of the program so that, the uniqueness of the program is based on the law, Indian self-determination with sovereignty, that allows the flexibility, this program allows the flexibility of our funding to meet
the needs of the community that are determined by that community.

MR. RICHARDSON: Congressional intent to address needs and then eventually --

MS. RICHARDSON: Right. So I love what she puts in here, no Indian left behind on and off reservation, so to really describe that.

MS. CAMPBELL: So when we go into, okay, so our part was saying this is the law. This is minimally what the law says we were goaled to do, right? That's the statement. Under the statement and, you know, is going into the second paragraph, we're going to start identifying one, why we're asking for and what's so unique, what's unique about the program, and then why we need additional funding, right, is that what we're saying?

MS. RICHARDSON: Right, talk about the NIA program as it currently exists.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well the statement that you talked about that there's a, Mike,
you ready?

MR. WALDRON: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: Just put statement of need and then you all had said that it is the 166, we'll just ad lib it, we can fix it later, okay? Provides service to, on and off reservation, meaning we service the urban, right?

And actually we can even state in the law where it says that. It says that the, it's Alaskan native, native Hawaiian, urban, right? Doesn't it say that? And the law also provides that, right? Right?

And then, so from there, then we're going, and after you make that statement, another statement you want to make sure that's in the statement of need, and just correct me when I'm wrong, is then we're going to go in and talk about how the additional amount that was indicated under WIA, the $55 million was, I don't know how you want to say it, was, I don't know, determined --
MR. RICHARDSON: In response to --

MS. RICHARDSON: The statistics of that time period, which was only funded for that first time period. And then it's been decreased every since.

(Off microphone discussion)

MR. RICHARDSON: To address economic needs at the time.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well WIA was what, '98.

MR. RICHARDSON: '98.

MALE PARTICIPANT: It was implemented in 2000.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: But the money has not, like I'm going to use kept up --

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: It funded at the minimal level?

MS. CAMPBELL: It hasn't kept up with items like, what are you going to say, it hasn't kept up with --

MS. WHITMAN: Cost of living --
MS. CAMPBELL: -- cost of living?

MS. WHITMAN: -- minimum wage.

DR. STAPP: It hasn't kept up with user population growth.

MS. CAMPBELL: Population growth?

MS. WHITMAN: Population growth.


Administrative costs?

MR. BERNAL: I think, we'll just go down? Angie, I think it's a good segue into the consequences, I'm sorry, just go down, population growth, cost, inflation, and so forth, it's a good segue because the lack of funding, the consequences of such actions have resulted in the then and the now. So in other words, probably a good place to insert your socioeconomic status, poverty, unemployment.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right, so B, we're going to think the state has a result, a lack of money --

MR. BERNAL: That resulted in...
this, the then and now.

   DR. STAPP: And the way this
population growth is a term they like to use, 
that relates to how many people that could
possibly vote for them.

   MS. CAMPBELL: Is that the thought
that's taken home here? Good. So I just want
to make sure, have you talked about population
increase, training costs?

   MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, cost of
tuition has rose tremendously from that time
period of '98.

   MS. JAMES: And in 2013 they're
going to go all computerized for GED testing.

   MALE PARTICIPANT: That's right.

   MS. JAMES: And it's going to
increase --

   MS. CAMPBELL: What did you say?

   MS. JAMES: For GED testing fees
they're going to increase in 2013 because it's
going to go electronic.

   MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. Excellent
example, excellent example, we're going to get a footnote on that one, okay?

MS. JAMES: Okay.

MS. CAMPBELL: I think that's a good one.

MS. JAMES: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: Because we're working on education as to this cause, if you do this it's going to cost us more to do that.

MS. JAMES: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: All right, population, cost of living, minimum wage, do we have that one, and admin costs. Is there anything else?

MR. BERNAL: I think, so speaking from Arizona, one of the consequences is we went the WIA, the 1998, that many programs shifted to like direct employment, so to stop gap measures. And we've kind of backed away from education enhancements. So that's where their population are kind of, got them in dead end jobs or basically positions where they
can't really obtain liveable wages.

MS. CAMPBELL: That's really important. What do you call that, direct hope?

MR. BERNAL: Well, I call it direct employment, where basically people come in with limited skill sets and we're putting them in jobs. But really what they need is development, they need enhancements, education. And that's what we're trying to decide.

MS. JAMES: For high growth, high demand jobs.

MS. CAMPBELL: And I like that because what happens is when we report we're calling for direct employment, we're not really creating, if you will, career pathways, career opportunities, right? So because we're moving from direct employment, using that word --

MS. MOLLE: The band aid effect of direct employment.
MS. CAMPBELL: Right.

MR. BERNAL: At least that's one consequence.

MS. CAMPBELL: Is it safe for me to say that it hinders the, you know, personal development, career pathways or sustainable jobs, something like that?

MS. JAMES: Long term, meaningful employment.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. WALDRON: How do you want to say it?

MS. CAMPBELL: On issues like the words that they understand.

MS. MOLLE: Meaningful employment.

MS. CAMPBELL: Can I use sustainable?

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Yes, use sustainable, I like that.

MS. MOLLE: But that only changes, we should include transportation cost and price of gasoline and even assisting --
MS. CAMPBELL: Oh, gas vouchers.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Would that be like the cost of living?

MS. BOWLAN: Transportation costs.

MS. CAMPBELL: Transportation.

MS. CARROLL: I think that's one of the most common supported services amongst all the tribes.

MS. CAMPBELL: So it can use this part of service that we could provide this --

MS. BOWLAN: When you only have 55, you know, you've got less money to work with and the costs have doubled or tripled.

MS. MOLLE: Even in the urban areas, our supported service for bus passes has gone up tremendously.

MR. LEWIS: Childcare.

MS. CAMPBELL: Childcare.

MR. LEWIS: Childcare costs.

MALE PARTICIPANT: We have participants who don't even qualify for --

MS. CAMPBELL: Now we're talking
with a tangent too much, but this was a very big part of the debate last night, so it's really good buzz words for us to look forward.

So what we're going to do is basically we'll provide on our presence. So Mike is capturing the statement of need, get these little examples here?

MR. WALDRON: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: And we're going to leave it up to craftsmiths to word it, you know, very confident that's going to happen.

So all right, I'm still thinking just in terms of where would we put the justification of it, just in terms of this is the number of, and we're not going to meet it, this is the number of Indian and Native Americans who have a high school diploma. Give them that statistical information, they like the stats.

It's one thing, we can say whatever we want but if it's not backed up or justified by research, I mean, at least some citation of a research is really important.
MS. RICHARDSON: I agree. And I think that we should use the census figures from '98, when that $55 million was implemented. And then we should use whatever the stats are from the 2010 census because I think that's going to tell a big story.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: We've found the latest publication of that.

MS. MOLLE: Of the unemployment and the poverty in Indian country? Somebody has, I can't think of who it is.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well I know that, and we could put a deliverable or an action for our office, is that we just wrote the '13 budget and I used some studies, I can't remember offhand what they were but we can certainly email them because I don't know them offhand, but they certainly are current studies that stated unemployment. And they're all research studies turning to --

MS. MOLLE: Well there's a dollar amount for our programs in that budget.

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433
MS. CAMPBELL: Please?

MS. MOLLE: The dollar amount, you said you just wrote the budget for 2013? What was the dollar --

MS. CAMPBELL: It's a working budget.

MS. MOLLE: But what are you looking at for Indian programs?

MS. CAMPBELL: It's a working budget.

MS. MOLLE: So $55 million and more?

MS. CAMPBELL: It's a working budget. It's a working budget and we're going to stay on task. It's a working budget. That's an honest statement.

MS. WHITMAN: Could I interject something at this point? I'm sorry, Councilwoman Richardson, you had brought up about the census figures and utilizing the 2010. And there was a report, a handout in our packet from Norm. Does everybody have
this?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MS. MOLLE: What's the title of the handout?

MS. WHITMAN: Okay, but what should be added to that is his email that he had sent to the census group because he states, and I'll give this to Michael so that he can make a copy for all of you, to attach to Norm's research here.

But it says, well mainly, "I strongly object to the presumption that DOL has to request special tabulations from the census bureau fairly soon for use in the allocation formulas for the Section 166 programs. This presumption would appear to be based on the idea that it is two years since the last decennial census and DOL has already begun the process of introducing new decennial data into the fund allocation process for the Native American work force programs, two years after a decennial. The decennial old census
no longer collects any data relevant to the
current allocation formulas for the Section
166 program. The fact that it is now two
years since the last decennial is irrelevant.
The issue before DOL and the grantee community
is not implementation of the 2010 census at
all. Not a single number used in the fund
allocation formulas for the Section 166
numbers will come from 2010 census. The only
census data set containing data historically
used to allocate Section 166 funds is the ACS,
that's American Community Survey. That data
is available annually in the five year ACS
estimates."

And he goes on to explain all of
these estimates. And so I wrote, and so he
concludes by saying that, "To proceed to
request ACS data for possible use in the
Section 166 fund allocation process without
DOL and the grantee community understanding
and fully considering all the implications
involved would, I believe, be poor public
policy as well as risking inappropriate
decisions that could effect the Section 166
programs for years to come." So I will give
this to Michael to make copies or email you
all so you can attach it to the data.

MS. CAMPBELL: Could you point out
the actual, what I'm going to do is put it in
our deliverables. Because I was emailed that
as well. It's really a --

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, it was emailed.

MS. CAMPBELL: -- an item for the
census. That would be --

MS. RICHARDSON: So the census
data will have no bearing on what it is that
we're doing.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right, I mean,
right. I mean, in terms of this paper or this
decision to use the census data but some of
them don't use it.

MS. RICHARDSON: Right.

MS. CAMPBELL: So that's, we'll
share that a little bit.
MS. WHITMAN: But you indicated about using the 1998 --

MS. RICHARDSON: The '98, right.

MS. CAMPBELL: We're using '98 data because the 2010 census, we're still working on, right? Okay. So it would be, what do we call that thing, now census, the ACS, and that was what this one was called, as a reference footnote?

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: What data did they base standing off of when they implemented the 2000 --

MR. WALDRON: It was 2000.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: -- 2000 census.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: So all right, and I think we're making progress here. So basically we're stating the law. And we have all the justification upfront. And this is our need. Our need is that what makes us unique is that we serve on and off.
reservations. We were funded $55 million back in 1988 --

MALE PARTICIPANT: '98

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: '98

MS. CAMPBELL: -- '98, that's what I have. I'm sorry, I'm going kind of fast. '98, right? But this $55 million is just, it's not enough. The reason why, basically, because it's not keeping up all of this.

Therefore, right, now we're going into almost like the summary kind of deal, right? So you ready? What's that section going to be called, I mean, you have the statement, this lack of funding, these will be the results and the consequences is how we, right?

MS. RICHARDSON: She does have 2000 census data in here.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, so serve this.

MS. RICHARDSON: Under the recommendations of the transition team, she
has high school dropout rates at 52 percent.

MS. CAMPBELL: Where are you?

MS. RICHARDSON: It's in the recommendations for the Department of Labor transitioning team.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. RICHARDSON: According to census 2000, unemployment among Native Americans in 2000 was 12.3 percent, which was more than twice the national average of 5.7 but if our national average is what it is now, what is it in Indian country? The highest poverty rate of any ethnic grouping and a 52 percent high school dropout rate, Page 2, yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: Mike is fixing that but I'm helping sort of streamline the thoughts when we write it.

MS. RICHARDSON: It also talks about the dramatic increase in tribal population for off reservation based Indians, to 25 percent on reservation, 21 percent for off reservations. So I think we can use some
of those numbers to help create a little profile.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: I think that's a good stat.

MS. RICHARDSON: It is a good stat.

MS. CAMPBELL: So what reference is that?

MS. RICHARDSON: It's on the recommendations of that labor transition team.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay. We're going to use the --

MS. RICHARDSON: Page 2.

MS. CAMPBELL: And these are all just, you know, references that the subgroup that pulls it together can refer back to and have available to make it easier to pull together, right? All right, and we're going to work on this for about another half hour so hopefully we'll get a good --

MR. BERNAL: Is he going to put it up there?
MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. Right now we're capturing the footnotes and I'm going to give this to him and he'll type it up, all right?

Okay, so know you talked about, you know, how the $55 million we were allocated, though we were appropriated this amount but, you know, times have changed, bottom line. And so we need more money. And if we don't get any more money then these are the consequences, is that what we're saying?

MR. WALDRON: The statistics are going to continue to go down.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay then, so what are the consequences? If we don't get additional funding, what are the consequences? Of course we're going to continue to have this high dropout rate, I don't know what we're saying.

MS. RICHARDSON: High unemployment.

MR. WALDRON: Jobless rate, high
unemployment, which is a big buzzword right now, jobs, jobs, jobs.

MS. CAMPBELL: Oh yes.

MR. WALDRON: There will be none, none, none.

MS. RICHARDSON: Well if we look at the unemployment rate as to what it is the national average, based on what this was --

MR. WALDRON: Or natives are --

MS. RICHARDSON: -- yes, this was 5.7 percent in 2000 and look at what it is now. What is it for Indians?

MR. WALDRON: Ten times that number.

MS. RICHARDSON: I mean, since we can't get any of the data for 2010, which I think is totally ridiculous. That's another story for another day.

MS. CAMPBELL: So what else, without this additional funding we're going to continue to have a high unemployment rate, right --
MS. RICHARDSON: Increased unemployment, increased poverty. I'd like to know what the homeless rate is for Native Americans right now.

MR. WALDRON: Crime, dropout rate data, only that's being funded.

MS. CAMPBELL: You know, and another way to look at it is how do we increase it? I mean, I think this is the reason why. And we already have very significant, you know, very high dropout. And I think that is a direct correlation to the lack of funding, that's maybe with the training, unprepared. Never mind it's happening, we're already there. We're there. And we're not able to --

MR. WALDRON: It only gets worse.

MS. CAMPBELL: -- they're not shovel ready as they call it, career ready right now. So we're already, even though we come in as disadvantaged, we're already getting never mind probably a good portion of
the, I'm not even going to go there, right?

MS. RICHARDSON: Right, but I

mean, so we need to somehow make that

statement that when we come in, we're already

more disadvantaged than the state's applicants

who waltz in off the street.

MS. WHITMAN: And adding onto your

comment, the latest report came out, it's on

the Web site of DOL. And it's a quarterly

report ending March 31st, 2012. And it gives

the annual goal for the state WIA adults

versus the Indian, Native Americans.

And the goal for Indian and Native

Americans is 54 percent for employment. For

the state adult program it's 53.1 percent,

that's their goal. And this is in the most

current report that's on the DOL Web site. So

there's --

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: We're

expected to do more with less.

MS. WHITMAN: Yes. And why are

our goals higher than the states?
MS. RICHARDSON: Considerably less.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Stapp.

DR. STAPP: Have we even had a level of need study for what we, if we will be funded at full amount because in the health side of the world we have everything's based on level of need and IHS is traditionally at 50 to 55 percent of need. So that's an easy thing for Congress to understand that hey, we're only halfway there. So how much would labor need to do a good job to provide services to all of our constituents?

MS. CAMPBELL: Based on the recommendation? I don't know.

DR. STAPP: Well, yes.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: In that study? We've never had one.

DR. STAPP: Because we're trying to justify $55 million but we know that that's all far short from the get go and it's only
gotten worse.

So if we had a way to establish
the level of need, what would it take to
provide the necessary services to get
everybody on board? Then that's our benchmark
to compare this to.

MS. MOLLE: I don't want to jump
ahead, but in the solution, the solution is
not to give our funding to the states. I
mean, because they're looking at all this
well, they can't, you know, we're not going to
increase this so we're just going to give it
to the states. I mean, that's been the
mindset.

MS. CAMPBELL: So maintaining
intent of the law for recommendations?

DR. STAPP: Yes and the level of
need, study of level of need.

MALE PARTICIPANT: That should be
in the introduction, in the intro.

MS. BOWLAN: Well have we proved
why we're unique in this, what we're saying so
far? I don't know that we've proved we're unique.

MR. WALDRON: Oh, because we're a service --

MS. BOWLAN: Well our states, they were whining, but we're not saying why we're different.

MR. WALDRON: We're classified as a political entity within the government. So it's --

MS. BOWLAN: Unless they eliminate the Workforce Investment Act completely, repeal it.

MS. CAMPBELL: Up here for our Statement of Urgency we're saying up front, it's involved.

MS. RICHARDSON: We're behind the ball.

(Crosstalk)

MS. BOWLAN: Weren't those two of the goals that the Workforce wanted to follow up in there, yes, reauthorization, well, you
know, trying to observe I think from other programs. Or the other option is to give money to the states.

MS. CAMPBELL: Getting to what Chris was saying, so should we put that right up front?

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Bernal.

MR. BERNAL: I think part of the uniqueness, taking 2 and 3 of the authorization document basically a starting point, Section 2 and 3.

MS. CAMPBELL: 2 and 3, do you want that right up front?

MR. BERNAL: Well I don't know, just for consideration, for the uniqueness piece, uniqueness piece, 2 and 3.

MR. WALDRON: Would you say 3 also?

MR. BERNAL: I'm sorry, 2 and 3.

MS. MOLLE: I just don't want to give them ammo to go south.

MS. CAMPBELL: No, that's a good
point. And it's a good observation. All right, so we are almost done here. You guys did it in an hour and a half. We'll break into teams and then we're going to go ahead and get as much done as possible to get it printed out. And then we'll at least have a first draft for Mr. Bernal and Ms. Carroll and Kim, Craig, and Duane, and Darrell to work on.

So we had said, and we're going to, another item that's sort of a side note, but what might be very helpful in addition to getting the recorder or secretary, is that we're going to implement some technology that was requested. And this was another one of Craig's ideas we were brainstorming, is that we can have teleconferences under a premise of a subgroup.

We have access, we have the capabilities, so we need to talk more over the telephone. And we can specifically put dates in there so we're keeping up to date with
what's going on. We don't have to say okay, workgroup, work on this paper then come back a year from now and say whether it's done, all right? We can put some specific things in there.

But right now, right, we had said okay, so, because we have not kept up with inflation and population growth and all the cost that comes with training our people who are disadvantaged in the first place, are more disadvantaged, the consequences are that, you know, it has contributed to the current unemployment rate, the high unemployment rate of on Indian reservations and off, within the Indian neighboring communities.

There's a smaller number and I don't think you could find that stack but you could certainly look for it, I bet you, there's a published smaller number of Indian and Native Americans that are ready to enter a sustainable career, or more should be ready but they don't think they can say.
If it does directly, the lack of funding does directly increase the number of unemployment, it contributes to the dropout rate, these are some of the consequences. What are some of the other consequences that we can think of?

So because we're underfunded, this is the result. This is what has happened. Should we put it, could we justify offhand in terms of the performance numbers?

And I don't know that you guys deal with the performance number in terms of the, because we had oh, I think also, too, I don't know if this is the right place to put it, but we need to let them know that we're asking for $100 million, the law says $55 million, but right now in the program in 2012 what I can talk about, is we were funded at $47 million.

So the funds decreased, even below the minimal amount. And we're not even keeping up with this already. But somewhere
in here, you know, it would be beneficial to note that minimally it's 55, but right now, years later, despite all of this, we're at $47 million.

MS. RICHARDSON: How would you craft that to make them understand that it was funded originally in '98 at $55 million and that has been the only time from '98 until now that we have had $55 million? Ever since then it has decreased and it's now at $47 million.

MS. CAMPBELL: You can put it here, that they served as statement of need. Where do we, do we state it just before the consequences? I don't know where we put that, or if you want to put it. And then we're going to move into a summary. I know it's hard to write something with a lot of people, but at least we've got the gist idea.

MR. LEWIS: Can I add an idea? And this is probably a good, you know, in a political, savvy way too, but it is, an increased cost is, you know, we have veterans
coming back and have counselor needs, PTSD, there's a lot of cost in that, in helping veterans.

MR. WALDRON: And they're a priority.

MR. LEWIS: And they're a priority that we have to serve them when we go to the front of the line.

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, that's good to add.

MR. WALDRON: Which is an increasing need.

MS. WHITMAN: And cost.

MR. RICHARDSON: And there's no additional funding to handle them.

MR. LEWIS: And mental health care and up for the families, counseling, medical care, prosthetics, I don't know but, you know.

MS. WHITMAN: No, but that's very important to add.

MR. LEWIS: And that catches the attention of people.
MS. CAMPBELL: And I'll go over and make sure one statement.

MALE PARTICIPANT: What was the last need statement?

MS. CAMPBELL: Services to veterans, veterans priority of service, does it go under the B where it's talking about $55 million but since 1998, that appropriation hasn't kept up. Another one would be the services to veterans, which is a priority for, you know, the Administration. So we're going to move on if there's not a statement --

MR. BERNAL: Just another question, I don't know the answer but we could be pressing to be a benchmark to see how WIA and Section 166 program has been funded relative to other Department of Labor programs assigned to them.

MS. WHITMAN: WIA programs?

MR. BERNAL: The 166 program, yes.

MR. WALDRON: We could do that once we're at the bottom.
MR. BERNAL: Okay, because so it's kind of disparate treatment.

MS. WHITMAN: Well they have that in the latest report.

MR. BERNAL: Okay but I mean, it should be part of the letter, that's why I'm stating it.

MS. WHITMAN: Yes.

MR. BERNAL: We know the numbers are not good, that will be --

MS. WHITMAN: Like a comparison.

MR. BERNAL: -- a compelling argument that, why has 166 been picked on, you know?

MS. CAMPBELL: Is that something, I don't remember that, if information's published, this is public information. So we'll turn it over to him, he's good with numbers in terms of pulling that up for us. We'll put it down as an action item, okay? This is something that's under the recommendations, this is supposed to get a
benchmark but the research -- the funding?

MS. SANCHEZ: Winona?

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, Lorenda.

MS. SANCHEZ: Has the Council been
given the national summary report for
appropriations for last program year?

MS. WHITMAN: I --

MS. SANCHEZ: If not, when Theresa
gets in, she doesn't get in until 9:00 our
time. If you haven't --

MS. WHITMAN: I don't recall that.

MS. SANCHEZ: Oh, okay. Because
in the summary it shows that we had 8,438 new
participants. And the eligible veterans
totaled 213.

So when we look at some of our
number size, I think we have to kind of get a
percentage and in our paper, but we did have
710 that were homeless. And of the 8,400,
6,602 had multiple barriers. And that was the
last program year.

MS. WHITMAN: That report should
be sent to the Council.

MS. SANCHEZ: Okay, I'll have Theresa send that.

MS. CAMPBELL: Can I make a, Lorenda?

MS. SANCHEZ: Yes?

MS. CAMPBELL: This is Angie. Can I make a recommendation in terms of the, you were accumulating a lot of different papers, right? If we could send the link or the information and we could take responsibility for that like to the DINAP program.

And so when we finalize this action plan and send it back out, all of these documents we're talking about, you know, we could put a link to it or we could send you the Word document of it. That way you're not carrying home a lot of paper. We save a lot of trees but yet and again, it's all under the items that we're working on here, opposed to having it scattered and we go, I don't know about you, but when I go back to the office I
have to re, sort of situate what all of these papers are for. But this way would be a pure streamline of the information and we'll have to get back. So on the action plan that DINAP --

MALE PARTICIPANT: The test.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right.

MS. SANCHEZ: I have sent each of those documents to Michael.

MS. CAMPBELL: And so let's get it down by, or be out by November, in November, probably before them, October, October 2012.

MS. SANCHEZ: So the summary's on one page. But I think we should know what we did last year when we're talking about what our characteristics looked like.

MS. CAMPBELL: And then that way the group that's going to --

MS. WHITMAN: So that some of the data arrives with paper.

MS. CAMPBELL: And that way the workgroups that are going to pull together
this paper, we'll have all the resources, we'll have it and so, but it will go onto the same file, same package, it's all the same information.

MR. RICHARDSON: But do we need that still for our discussions today on this? Do we still need to have that and get a look at it?

MS. CAMPBELL: Well no, we're going to move on in about ten minutes, on to the next deliverable, because we're just going to go ahead and try to summarize this one or two pages. We're already half an hour over. So that way we don't, not get to the other priorities.

And so if you want to, if you wanted to have further discussions, we can add you to the workgroup because they're going to do more work on it. But at least we have a framework to start from. We'll have, it is a priority, it is a priority we'll present to Jane, let her know that we are going to do
some advocacy in Outreach, we are going to do
a one, two pager as a guideline, this is what,
maybe not give her the details what we
produced but that's going to be the plan
that's going to be turned over to anyone who's
identified on that. And everybody else will
be cc'd. So you'll have it. And when we come
back together with a teleconference, that's
when we'll do the more discussion necessary.

MR. WALDRON: She said she sent
those documents to Mike.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. BERNAL: So the subcommittee,
the advocacy subcommittee will come up with
the first draft and present it to the entire
Council for review and approval?

MS. CAMPBELL: Well no, what we're
going to do is the subcommittee will pull it
together as a draft.

MR. BERNAL: Right, okay.

MS. CAMPBELL: We're going to work
and go through the Effective Management
Workgroup. And the reason being, is because we can't bring a formal decision to the Council without having a formal meeting. We're allowed to have two per year. So that means that we wouldn't be able to do a whole presentation to the Council until next year.

MR. BERNAL: Wow!

MS. CAMPBELL: But, however, another avenue would be to pull it together and present it to the Effective Management Workgroup, which is an approved, in the charter, workgroup.

And I think that this group was also included into the, way back under FACA in the charter, it's included, the Secretary authorizes us to meet as a Council twice per year. And that's, those are the two dates that we're on.

MR. BERNAL: So if it goes to Effective Management Workgroup that authorize and approve the first draft, is it considered approved by the Council, good to go?
MS. CAMPBELL: No.

MR. RICHARDSON: No. Can the Council meet via conference call?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, but if you're going to meet, what I'm going to have to do, I have to run that through Nick. I'm thinking yes, I'm not 100 percent certain. But I know that if you're going to meet whether it's via teleconference, whatever, it has to be put in the Federal Register. That I do know, all right? So we could look at, I'm thinking about time and then --

MS. MOLLE: Let's set a date for the conference call so that we're ahead of the time frame and we'll get it in the Federal Register. And that will give us some true deadlines of when we need to approve this.

MS. CAMPBELL: Because nothing says the maximum amount of time, it doesn't say the max. There's a minimal amount you have to have.

MR. LEWIS: At least 15 days, but
you just go under the guise of cost, we're saving cost by the travel. And that's become --

DR. STAPP: But if you do that, we don't want to get carried away where we have a smaller conference call and then it takes the place of our next physical meeting.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right.

MR. RICHARDSON: That we don't want to do. But I think we also don't want to see this buried and waiting for action, you know --

DR. STAPP: See, this thing it says that we can't have a conference call, and it not be an official Council meeting.

MS. WHITMAN: Right, exactly.

DR. STAPP: This is kind of a working conference call.

MS. CAMPBELL: And this is an official Council meeting. And a resolution can be passed at this meeting, that gives this sub-workgroup authority to continue and
complete this project.

MS. MOLLE: And to approve it, and
let's put a deadline on it.

MS. CAMPBELL: So you can give the
subgroup the authority to work on the project,
complete it, and execute it. And then we'll
follow up to update via teleconference.

MS. JAMES: I motion to do that.

MS. CAMPBELL: I can't say it,
someone else can say it.

MS. JAMES: I motion to have the
Outreach Committee follow through with this
project and complete it.

MS. MOLLE: Is there a deadline
you want to put on that?

MS. JAMES: By --

MR. WALDRON: Christmas?

MS. JAMES: January, December?

MR. WALDRON: Push them, push
them.

MS. JAMES: December?

MR. WALDRON: December 31st?
MS. JAMES: December 31st?

MR. WALDRON: Because it's urgent.

MS. JAMES: All right, December 31st.

MS. WHITMAN: Is there a second?

MS. CAMPBELL: All right, so with that plan --

MS. WHITMAN: So the motion is that the Outreach Subgroup will develop the --

MS. JAMES: Will develop and complete.

MS. WHITMAN: -- develop --

MS. JAMES: Develop, complete, and execute the strategies for --

MR. BERNAL: Final draft.

MS. JAMES: -- the final draft.

MALE PARTICIPANT: Of this two page document.

MS. JAMES: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: And they're going to, it's call the Statement of Urgency was what we thought, the Statement of Urgency
related to Section 166.

MS. JAMES: So the Statement --

MS. CAMPBELL: Statement of Urgency of what?

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. JAMES: By December 31st.

DR. STAPP: Then it's presented to the Effective Workgroup at your next meeting. Then the Effective Workgroup will take it to our next face-to-face Council Meeting.

MR. WALDRON: Yes, we'll have it all done by the 31st then it will just be an action item for the Advisory Board's second meeting.

MS. WHITMAN: All those in favor by the December 31 deadline?

MALE PARTICIPANT: Aye.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Aye.

MS. WHITMAN: Those who oppose?

MR. RICHARDSON: Hold on.

MS. WHITMAN: I'm sorry. Ms. Richardson?
MS. RICHARDSON: I'm sorry, I thought that the motion was to authorize the Effective Management Workgroup.

MS. CAMPBELL: We're authorizing Outreach.

MS. WHITMAN: It's authorizing the Outreach Subgroup to develop the paper.

MS. CAMPBELL: Which is a new group that --

MS. RICHARDSON: Oh, okay.

MS. CAMPBELL: It was a subgroup that was identified at the last meeting, it's in the notes. That's one of the priorities, is to advocate, is to do outreach for this program. So that's a sub-workgroup in and of itself.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay, and then when that draft is completed December 31, then it is forwarded to Perspective Management --

MS. WHITMAN: Perspective Management --

MS. RICHARDSON: -- Workgroup,
which at point in time we will have a
cconference call and we will have the
authorization to approve that?

    MR. RICHARDSON: The Effective
Management Workgroup is authorized to the
final approval? That's what I thought --

    MR. WALDRON: Oh, yes, no they're
not. They've got to approve that final draft
for the Council then take it to the Council.

    MR. RICHARDSON: So we're still
going to be next year before this product gets
approval.

    MS. CAMPBELL: Well first of all,
let me just clarify something. The Advocacy
Workgroup is a sub-workgroup in and of itself.
It doesn't meet, it doesn't account to, it
doesn't report to the Effective Management
Workgroup. This was identified and approved
as independent, subwork, we're going to put
resources in.

    What we're saying, what I heard on
this motion, was that the Council today, is
making a motion to allow this sub-workgroup to create, develop, finalize, and proceed with this document. And they'll come back and provide formal update. The Council is in session so we could do that now. But we'll come back and give an update to the group, to all of the Council members who want to attend.

MR. WALDRON: So we can just skip the Effective Management part.

MS. CAMPBELL: You've got it.

MR. WALDRON: Go directly to the Advisory Board on the phone, on the 31st.

Well, in or near.

MS. CAMPBELL: Or soon thereof.

I'm going to make sure that that's going to be one of our deliverables. I did think I'd have to publish it in the Federal Register. We can do a teleconference as consistent with one more tick in the technology step.

MR. WALDRON: So the question would be if we get the total Advisory Board on a teleconference to accept, we can move it
forward from there if we have a quorum. Could we constitute business as a teleconference group?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes!

MR. WALDRON: All right. Well that's beautiful. That will eliminate a lot of time.

MS. JAMES: And then we don't have to wait a whole year.

MR. RICHARDSON: It's not one of the budgeted face-to-face meetings.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right, it's not a budgeted.

MR. RICHARDSON: And that's what we have to be careful about, is that the funds expended to conduct workgroup teleconferences don't supplant a face-to-face Advisory Council meeting.

MS. WHITMAN: And also, this doesn't have to be published in the Federal Register, does it?

MS. CAMPBELL: Then we're going,
quick question I have to answer.

    MS. WHITMAN: I'll say prayer now.

    MR. BERNAL: What's stopping us

from presenting a motion today as an action
item, in approving the Outreach letter as
presented, as outlined today, for
implementation let's say January 2013?

    MS. CAMPBELL: Nothing prohibits
that. It is an approved sub-workgroup and a
resolution is on the table to allow them to do
just that.

    MR. RICHARDSON: Except the
Council will want to give that authority
without seeing the product.

    MS. CAMPBELL: But that's why I am
saying, that's why you have the sub-
workgroups. You take a task and you assign it
to a sub-workgroup, this Outreach Sub-
workgroup, that can conduct a teleconference
without federal notice.

    FEMALE PARTICIPANT: In workgroup.

    MS. CAMPBELL: Right. The
workgroup can get together and have a teleconference without a federal notice. With your approval here, they can go forward. The sub-workgroup can go forward, do exactly what Jessica proposed. And then, if it's decided later that we want to have a teleconference, nothing's in the law or the charter itself that says there's a maximum of, I mean there's a minimum of these two meetings.

MR. RICHARDSON: But I guess, you know, the point of clarity that I'm hearing is that the subgroup's going to do it's work, going to complete it's product.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right.

MR. RICHARDSON: And it's going to report its final product back to the Effective Management Workgroup or back to this Council, this Council in a telephone conference call meeting. At which point, if accepted, it will be presented as a recommendation or advice from this Council. Or a product from this Council.
MS. CAMPBELL: Or, you can give
the approval today to do it. We could do it
today, we have a quorum.

MR. RICHARDSON: Without seeing
the product.

DR. STAPP: But we don't have the
product today. We should do it in the order
that --

MR. WALDRON: I would recommend
you see the product.

MS. WHITMAN: So we're talking
about seeing the draft before the Council can
make any sort of decision, is that it?

DR. STAPP: No, we're talking
about seeing the product now.

MS. WHITMAN: Right, the final
product. But to us it's going to be a draft
because the Council will have to approve it.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay.

DR. STAPP: So we'll take her
timeline and mix it in with what Elkton just
said, and we'll have a fill Council conference
call in January.


That answer your question, Elk?

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes it does. I mean, that clarifies that, you know, the Committee's empowered to do its work, it's given its charge. But, you know, it's not a product of the Advisory Council's approval until we've seen the product.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, that's an excellent point, that's an excellent point.

MS. RICHARDSON: And then how does this product get given to Congress?

MS. CAMPBELL: Through our advocacy Outreach effort, that's independent of this Council.

MS. JAMES: So do I need to restate my motion?

MS. CARROLL: So that might be another task charged to the Outreach group, is to have recommendations for dispersing the paper?
MS. CAMPBELL: So if you like. We can state, you know, we'll state we're going to first have to vote on this motion and then we'll be able to, the Council can look at this.

MS. JAMES: Should I restate the motion?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, please.

MS. JAMES: Okay. I make a motion to provide the Outreach Subgroup with a recommendation to continue the project and the papers. And to report back to the Council by, help me out with the wordage, please, by December 31st. And we'll follow up with a conference call in January 2013, with the full Council, quorum, to move forward. Does that sound good? Do I need to add more?

MS. CAMPBELL: That's good.

MS. WHITMAN: Okay, please clarify for me, the Outreach Subgroup Committee of the Council, the motion is to allow the Outreach Subgroup of the Council to continue and
complete the Statement of Urgency product on WIA Section 166, and report back to the Council, no, and complete the product by December 31st, and follow up with a telephone conference with the Council in January 2013. Are there any corrections to that?

MS. JAMES: No.

MS. WHITMAN: Okay, any discussion? Councilman Stapp? All those in favor say aye?

MALE PARTICIPANT: Aye.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Aye.

MS. WHITMAN: All those opposed? All right, the motion has been adopted.

MS. CARROLL: I have a question.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: On this paper here, it identifies what we keep referring to as a subcommittee as a workgroup. So, what is it officially? Is it a full workgroup or is it a subcommittee of a workgroup?
MS. CAMPBELL: It's a sub-workgroup, that's how it's termed in the charter.

MS. CARROLL: If it's a sub-workgroup, what is it a sub of?

MS. WHITMAN: Of which group?

MS. CAMPBELL: Of the larger Council, a subcommittee.

MS. WHITMAN: Of the Effective Management Workgroup?

MS. CARROLL: That's what I'm asking. Because according to this --

MS. CAMPBELL: I don't know how they define it.

MS. CARROLL: According to this it's just another workgroup.

MS. CAMPBELL: It's a workgroup. So it's a sub-workgroup.

MS. CARROLL: It's not a sub of anything.

MR. WALDRON: There was already a workgroup in Arizona.
MS. CAMPBELL: In the charter, they call the subgroups sub-workgroups. That's how it's termed in the charter, sub-workgroups.

MR. LEWIS: But this particular group has a project. And so when that project's done, that group is done.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Then it's complete.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right.

MS. CARROLL: I don't believe so.

MR. LEWIS: So it should be ad hoc or something because it has a special project. And then we end it, we phase out when we're done with that, December 31st.

MS. CARROLL: That was not my understanding when the workgroup was formed.

MR. LEWIS: That was on the Our Story. This is not necessarily the Our Story, right?

MS. CARROLL: No, no, no, there was, in Louisiana, it was suggested that we
have a workgroup to do Outreach, an advocacy workgroup. And that's this workgroup. This workgroup has been tasked with completing a draft document. That's just one task. But that doesn't mean that that's all they're doing. It's my understanding, now I just want to be clear.

DR. STAPP: Well, we did need further clarification in what we want to talk through. Because if we're giving it as a workgroup from Louisiana and continuing, then it's on equal par with like the Effective Workgroup.

MS. CARROLL: That's my question.

DR. STAPP: -- but we kept calling it a subgroup like it reports back to somebody else first, which is kind of a different category. The workgroups have to be approved and on the list and they're on ongoing group.

MS. CARROLL: Right.

DR. STAPP: But a subgroup could be tasked with an individual --
MS. CARROLL: Right.

DR. STAPP: -- so that's what I thought this was kind of a project for this group.

MS. CAMPBELL: The Council can clarify if it's going to be a sub-workgroup that reports to the Effective Management Workgroup or is it going to be a workgroup.

MS. CARROLL: My understanding was that it had already been determined. And that's where this obviously came from.

MR. LEWIS: But you can amend it. You can amend it with Council, right?

MS. CARROLL: I don't know that we want to. I think we wanted a workgroup.

MS. CAMPBELL: A workgroup, for Outreach.

MS. CARROLL: So it's a workgroup. Is that how you understood?

MR. BERNAL: I'm fine with either way. I believe technically in Louisiana it was framed by Chair Lorenda Sanchez to be a
sub-committee, of the Education Committee.

MR. WALDRON: Well she's here, I can ask her for clarification. Hey Lorenda?

MS. SANCHEZ: Yes?

MR. WALDRON: Have you been following that little discussion, able to hear it all?

MS. SANCHEZ: Parts of it.

MR. WALDRON: Yes. Looking for clarification on workgroup versus sub-workgroup in reference to communications that we had in Louisiana on Outreach, sub-workgroup or workgroup.

MS. CAMPBELL: And also a comment, that it is --

MS. SANCHEZ: My understanding was that we designated it as a sub-workgroup, and partially due to the DOL position that they only wanted us to have five like standing workgroups. And our numbers were beyond the five.

MS. WHITMAN: That's right, I do
recall that being brought up. Because we're limited on the number of workgroups.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right, but also too

MR. WALDRON: So it's classified as a sub-workgroup? Of what group?

MS. CAMPBELL: Can I make a comment? Also too, last year's meeting, it was last year's meeting, under this PY 2012 Strategic Plan, this is a priority, our number one priority. So, I mean, the Council can identify it as a group or a, I mean a workgroup, and still maintain under five.

I mean, right now there's not five official workgroups. We have the Effective Management Workgroup, the Census Workgroup, and the Education, that's it, and Education, NIT, that's three.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I'm more confused. What we identified as one of our priority
projects was the Our Story.

MS. WHITMAN: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: This is not Our Story. This is an advocacy paper for more funding. I mean, you know, I think it's important, I mean, it's something we've been working on for a long time but it's not Our Story. Our Story is something totally different.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right, I agree.

Okay, so this is not a priority.

MR. RICHARDSON: Did we not engage this whole discussion as an opening this morning for a continuation of the Our Story Workgroup and drafting of this two page document white paper? So why is this not a subgroup of the Our Story Workgroup?

I mean, if we're trying to keep this to a minimum of five workgroups, and as I look at this list here, you know, I see seven. And Outreach is one of them. And believe me, I have no problems about these
being individual workgroups.

But, you know, I see Census as sort of ad hoc. Census comes up every ten years and doesn't need to be a workgroup, an existence in 2019, I don't know, or 2018.

But I think we could have five workgroups and, you know, Outreach, we just need to decide if, and define it, or maybe it's already been done, as to whether or not it stands on its own as a workgroup. Or is it a subgroup of one of the other workgroups?

And more specifically, this project we've been discussing for the past two hours, here, you know, is it part of the function of a workgroup that's standing on its own or is it a sub-workgroup?

To me it doesn't really matter as long as the work gets done and we get the product we're looking for. But if it's going to be ongoing, an ongoing part of one workgroup or another, then let's appropriately place it where it belongs.
MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Stapp?

DR. STAPP: Building on what Elk said, you know, I see this as just a specific task that the Council at large is responsible for because it's an advocacy paper for us as the Council and for WIA programs. So I don't see it really being necessary to tie it to Effective Management or the Our Story Workgroup.

Our Story can use it once we finish it, you know, and they probably should use it. But it doesn't necessarily have to be tied to that project. We need this in general as a Council as an ongoing educational tool when we go on the Hill. And that's one of the ways we should be using it, is making business to the Hill and saying hey, this is why we're important, this is why reauthorization's important.

You know that when you go on the Hill they only give you five minutes. And it would be hard to squeeze in the whole story.
So this two page paperwork here that really boils it down to here's the high bullet points that we need you to know, and that's what this is.

So I see it more as for the Council as the whole and, you know, we're getting so caught up on what group it belongs to or it's in a subgroup or whatever, it's just the task that needs to be completed. And we have a good group of people working on it.

So the way you had it earlier where that group can report directly to us on a conference call as a Council, I think we're done, we're ready to go. So I make a motion to we handle it that way.

MS. WHITMAN: So Councilman Waldron, exactly, I was going to ask, does the motion just remain as approved?

MR. BERNAL: Well, her motion was to get the job done. So I'll make the motion to, how to classify the project. Because Kim's right. And if we made it a subgroup,
we've got to follow all these other rules and it's an ongoing and we need to have it on the list and all that kind of stuff.

So if we just keep it as a task of the Council, then we can do what Elk said and what she presented. So my motion is to make it a task group of the full Council, reportable to the full Council.

MR. WALDRON: And I'll second it.

MS. WHITMAN: All right, any discussion? Councilman Waldron?

MR. WALDRON: We're done.

MS. WHITMAN: Okay. All those in favor?

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Aye.

MALE PARTICIPANT: Aye.

MS. WHITMAN: Those who oppose?

All right, the motion has been adopted.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay so we have like, great job, this is new, it's different. But I think we're making progress. That's where we're at and I appreciate all the,
because it is, there's a lot of different sub-
workgroups, the charts, so we've finalized, we
are moving on. Because we're going to
summarize this and then we'll going to go to
lunch. So at least we got at least this
portion done and we'll be able to pull it
together and turn it over to the identified
individuals who will work on it.

Now on Our Story, we were talking
about, where we left off before we put the
motion, I want to wrap up so we can go to
lunch real quick, because I don't want to lose
this thought.

So we had said that, okay, this is
the impact or the consequences of us not
receiving funding minimally at $55 million.
We really need $100 million. Is there any
pointers we want to make in our summary or are
we good? These are the recommendations of --

DR. STAPP: We just have to know
that while we say we want $100 million, we've
got to say why, and it was for the level of
need on it. And we'll leave those numbers
from '98 to compare it to the $50,000 or
$55,000 back then.

    MS. CAMPBELL: Right, we could use
the numbers to reinforce the why.

    MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman James?

    MS. JAMES: Lorenda had also sent
Mike some other papers, that's the
Administration of Native American Workforce
Programs, History, Policy, and Common Sense.
And it's a seven pager, it was formed back in
February 2011. You could utilize that
information within that paper, as a footnote,
resource.

    MS. CAMPBELL: What do you mean a
resource for a footnote?

    MS. JAMES: It's called The
Administration of Native American Workforce
Program. And it has really, really good
language that quotes the law, about seven
pages.

    MS. WHITMAN: So that's been sent
to Michael?

MS. JAMES: Yes, that should have been sent.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: We're going to save paper, we're going to save paper. We're going to take responsibility. All of these different footnotes, we have these notes, we're tasked with pulling it together.

Before we leave, one thing that would be helpful, Mike, is if we at least get the action plan in a draft, well no, not even that, but a draft of draft because this is what we're going to tell at least Jane tomorrow, a little bit about this, a draft, draft. We're going to email everything to everybody, all right?

And we're going to email it by, we can pull together and I'll be in on Friday. We could send it back up primarily to the main task group, and we'll cc the rest of the Council.
MS. MOLLE: I just want to make a friendly reminder --

MS. CAMPBELL: You got that?

MS. MOLLE: -- or a clarification that in this whole paper that we're doing, that we do put some success stories in there or, you know, it's all, despite the fact of high disparities and barriers to employment and low funding, we have successfully, you know, X amount of people or whatever we need to use, percentages, I think we need to get the successes in there as well.

MS. CAMPBELL: I'll give you a good example. My understanding is a good colleague of ours, and she probably is the highest ranking official for Indian and Native Americans in the Federal Government, and that's Jody Gillett, in the White House. I know that she has participated in this program, and there's not more success than that.

MR. WALDRON: Tom Dowd was the
Assistant Secretary --

MS. CAMPBELL: Tom Dowd, Jody Gillett is the liaison for President Obama at the White House.

MALE PARTICIPANT: She was in the program?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MS. MOLLE: So we need to really cite some of that.

MS. CAMPBELL: So even example, a good concrete example, you know, folks that come out of this program are working for your President. That's a true career path, or an opportunity.

DR. STAPP: We should cite them in that order too, right after we do this but whatever we get, here's the impact it had.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right. And this would be a good bridge where we can go to lunch and tie in, because we're going to give an example of a success. And that would tie right in to Our Story.
MS. RICHARDSON: Actually, Lorenda

has in the listening session on Page 2, she

has examples of 41 former participants who are

now Tribal Chair People, Thomas Dowd, former

Chief of the Division of Native American

Programs, and Deputy Assistant Secretary.

MS. CAMPBELL: Choose whichever

one because he's the Secretary of the

Department of Interior, the Bureau of Indian

Affairs is another, I mean there's countless

examples, William Mendoza, at Education,

there's a lot of examples, you're right, that

would be a good bridge. So with that --

MR. RICHARDSON: Before we break,

I just want to ask if we can make sure that

the people on, our colleagues on the line here

on the phone can hear everything? I know that

mic over there, so when Jacob and Jessica

speak, I don't know if our colleagues on the

phone are able to hear it because that mic, I

don't know if it has a weak or dead battery in

it, but it's not very audible. If we can get
MR. WALDRON: Well it's not a part of his system. It's probably, could have used that one over there. Lorenda, was you able to hear Jessica and Jacob?

MS. SANCHEZ: I can barely hear them.

MR. WALDRON: Okay.

DR. STAPP: Lorenda, can you hear me okay? This is Dr. Stapp.

MS. SANCHEZ: I can hear you, Dr. Stapp.

DR. STAPP: Okay.

MR. WALDRON: How about Carla?

MS. SANCHEZ: I can't hear Carla.

MR. WALDRON: Can't hear Carla.

MS. BOWLAN: I'm not speaking.

MALE PARTICIPANT: This is Carla.

MS. WHITMAN: Also, how soon is the Council able to see the meeting notes from yesterday through tomorrow, from the Court Reporter?
MS. CAMPBELL: Well normally it takes several months. However, Court Report, Eric, hi, Eric, sorry. Normally what's the turnaround for the notes, the meeting notes?

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: Ten business days, so we will --

MS. WHITMAN: Ten business days, all right. So can that be posted someplace that the Council can have access to it?

MS. CAMPBELL: One second. What we'll do is, ten business days, today's the 16th, right? One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, the week of November 5th. Eric, the week of November 5th is about 15 working business days. So we would have a working draft, I mean a final product? So that's another deliverable.

MS. WHITMAN: Right.

MS. CAMPBELL: And by that time we'll have the contract in place, specifically you guys, we'll get you guys up to speed to
how we'll need that, but we'll deliver.

MS. WHITMAN: So by November 5th
the Council will have access, they will let us
know like how we can access all of the meeting
notes that will come from the Court Reporter.

MS. CAMPBELL: We could provide a,
I'm really into the links. Two things,
always, all Council meeting notes are always
available on gsa.gov. We'll all provide that
link itself as well as, but all the meeting
notes are there. I have to put them there.
All of them are there. And then too,
specifically this one so it could be
highlighted. We'll send the link and it will
open right up to the PDF.

MS. RICHARDSON: One of those
other deliverables is what we talked about
yesterday, is about posting what has taken
place on the site. So maybe someone could
post that link onto the Council Web site so
the grantees can go in and see.

MS. WHITMAN: Right.
MS. CAMPBELL: We're going, we'll cross that bridge after we kind of like put some closure here. Because sometimes we get multiplied tasks and we lose, you know, real deliverables, you know, finalizing sort of action items. And we'll probably sort of sum this up but, all right, so it's break, 12:00 noon.

MS. WHITMAN: Are there any questions or comments before recess for lunch?

MS. CAMPBELL: Can I add one more thing? One more, we have one task accomplished, right? Or at least put forward as the task. So we're going to come back, we'll have two hours before we go into public comment. And we do have three individuals here that will provide public comment this afternoon. So from 2:00 to 4:00 is public comment.

And when we come back, what is it, what time is it, 1:00, 1:30 let's say? 1:30? Okay, so we have about a half an hour. So
what do we want to work on next, the Our
Story? Or what is going to be the next
deliverable we want to --

MS. CARROLL: Have we finished
prioritizing our projects?

MS. CAMPBELL: It's however you
want it, it might be a good use of that half
hour, Winona, you want to use that next half
an hour?

MS. WHITMAN: I think that would
be --

MS. CAMPBELL: You want to
prioritize, list them? Okay, and then maybe
task them out? I don't know. Just think
about that when we were doing lunch so, how
about an hour and a half then we'll come back
and redo our priority list and then decide if
there's something that we want to work on,
because the public comment may take about an
hour. Then after that we'll be able to
continue to work.

MS. CARROLL: So we will return at

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
202-234-4433
1:30?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, 1:30 so everybody will have enough time to sort of --

MS. WHITMAN: All right.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay?

MS. WHITMAN: We're recessing until lunch.

(Whereupon, the meeting in the above-mentioned matter went off the record at 11:55 a.m. and went back on the record at 1:35 p.m.)
MS. WHITMAN: All right, the meeting is being called back to order, being resumed. And so we have a half hour or no, we have 25 minutes or less to prioritize projects. I believe that that's what was decided when we recessed for lunch. So, yes, Craig is going to assist on this about prioritizing projects because public comment will start at 2:00.

MR. LEWIS: Are we using that stuff over there?

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Molle?

MS. MOLLE: Education measure, I think that's a priority.

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, education measure.

MS. MOLLE: And how are we going to implement the reporting for that?

MR. WALDRON: That's up there?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, first one.
MR. WALDRON: Yes.

DR. STAPP: What's the difference between that page and that third one over?

MR. LEWIS: That one was just, that's an extra one as you were adding other We Believe projects, that was just put in more.

MS. JAMES: Is that a six?

MR. LEWIS: Oh yes, okay, I see what you mean.

MS. WHITMAN: Can we read those? I think it's my vision. Can you read them?

MR. LEWIS: Yes, education measure, full implementation, the second one is to update the --

MS. JAMES: We have Lorenda on the phone.

MR. LEWIS: Number 2 is update software BearTracks, make it more user friendly, incorporate the education as necessary. The third one is accountability system, to include GPRA transparency. The
fourth is technical assistance and logistical support. Fifth one is white paper for reauthorization. Number six is to continue Our Story. And that's all inclusive, right, there isn't anything missing?

MR. WALDRON: So are they in order of priority or are they just numbered as we went about them?

MS. WHITMAN: We have to prioritize them.

MS. MOLLE: And Group Number 3, right below that, it's got partner 477/166.

MR. WALDRON: Annual report.

MS. MOLLE: Well, prior to the annual report. remember we talked about --

MR. WALDRON: Oh, implementation with --

MS. MOLLE: Or partnering the 477 with 166, at the conferences and things. We talked about that yesterday.

MR. WALDRON: Yes, well that one was in reference to the Advisory Board having
quarterly reports and out to the community.

    MS. MOLLE: That's the annual report.

    MR. WALDRON: Right.

    MS. MOLLE: The other one --

    MR. WALDRON: Was it to include this?

    MS. MOLLE: That was your idea, do you recall?

    MR. WALDRON: I probably did, yes, I'm sure I did because that is under mine.

    MR. LEWIS: So that's Number 7.

    MS. MOLLE: Yes, how we need to work --

    MR. WALDRON: Work together.

    MS. MOLLE: -- instead of the division --

    MR. WALDRON: And yes, in unity, right, Chris is right, I remember now.

    MR. LEWIS: Because a lot of this is duplication and --

    MS. MOLLE: Right, Number 7,
Number 7, and then Number 8 would be the annual report, that we don't get a report of what --

MR. WALDRON: Anymore, like we used to.

MS. MOLLE: We haven't had a report for a long time.

MR. LEWIS: So there's eight?

MR. WALDRON: You want to move your flow chart over there so you could write over there instead of walking back and forth?

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: I've got them over here.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Okay.

MR. RICHARDSON: Well we did take action yesterday, that the Our Story project was our priority. So then I guess we're now seeking what's --

MS. MOLLE: Education measures.

MR. WALDRON: So choosing again, what's number two?

MS. MOLLE: Education measures.
MR. WALDRON: That was Number 1.

MS. MOLLE: Education measure.

MR. LEWIS: So we're going to reorder the eight, right?

MR. WALDRON: Excuse me?

MR. LEWIS: We're going to reorder the eight bullets into first priority?

MR. WALDRON: I think so.

MR. LEWIS: And, okay, so --

(Crosstalk)

MS. MOLLE: They weren't in order.

That was just brainstorming.

MR. LEWIS: Oh, okay.

MS. MOLLE: So now we can do that.

MR. WALDRON: So they weren't in order.

(Crosstalk)

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I think that one that is very important and it is very timely would be TA. I think that considering all
that's happened recently, that a plan to
provide technical assistance to the grantee
community is something that we need to
address.

MR. WALDRON: So we want to do
like the top five?

MS. CARROLL: I'm wondering if we
have eight to choose from, and maybe to start
off with we could each write down our top
three and then, you know, look at those and
see how many are, I don't know, because I
don't see how we're going to --

MS. MOLLE: What are we presenting
to, is it Jane Oates tomorrow morning?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MS. MOLLE: The education measure
--

MR. WALDRON: The priorities.

MS. CAMPBELL: What are the
priorities? We're doing a few minutes we can
get the bowls if we held them out.

MS. MOLLE: And the TAT.
MR. WALDRON: So how many
priorities do we get to give her, all eight?

MS. MOLLE: All we can fit in an
hour, right? Am I right?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. And also a
really good key is who's going to do the
presentation to her, and what information we
want to ensure that she receives. And also,
too, so how much she receives, how much, and
really what we would like to present to, what
you all would like to present to the
Administration, understanding that the
Administration can change. And if it does
change we would have to come back and reread
to someone else.

And maybe it's the highlights, the
specific items that you want to come across
that's going to be key. But really there too,
I would have the Council consider putting
before, really, not so much recommendations
for approval, but really specify what we are
going to outline and work on. This is what
we're going to do so whatever goes forward, she understands. But more importantly, is what we'll put in, I'll put in, in the transition paper for the incoming Administration, despite who it is.

MR. WALDRON: Right, so I'll go with Kim Carroll on her. I think the education measure and the T&TA logistical support are two very important topics that should be up in the forefront as our people need training, and education we've been working on for eight years for those of us who have been working on it for eight years, that's how long we've been working on it. And I know Our Story's in there too so those three, you know, for me anyway.

MR. LEWIS: We're going to use the, we're doing both this --

MS. WHITMAN: Okay, that will be good.

MR. LEWIS: So increase the funds.

MS. WHITMAN: Okay. So the first
one is the education measure and second is the

MR. WALDRON: The T&TA logistic

support and then it was Our Story.

MS. WHITMAN: Our Story third.

MR. WALDRON: And those were just

my idea and I was just supporting Kim's.

MR. LEWIS: Okay, what was the one

that I need?

MR. WALDRON: Education measures.

MR. LEWIS: After that one?

MS. WHITMAN: TAT.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Grantee

community.

MR. LEWIS: Right.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: And also too, it

might be helpful to give her some information

or at least make her aware that we are working

on a task that would be a two page, that two

page white paper that we are going to do some

advocacy and outreach.
MR. WALDRON: I think another one we talked about, not only that mission statement, but was around the consultation, how WIA Advisory Board was going to be included in that. Has that been determined?

That almost sounded like we were not going to be, that there's going to be a second group of tribal leaders or --

MS. CAMPBELL: Well as it stands now, there's not the consultation policy for the Department of Labor, is still in clearance, so there's not an official consultation. I know it's been out for public comment and the public comment has closed. I think that there was only two comments that came in, both from Alaskan entities about the definition of Alaskan entities and that's it. So I know the public comment is closed with both the 30 and the 60 day notice went out. And it is in final clearance.

So when Gabriela, Dr. Lemus, came and spoke to the Council, she had indicated
and it had still included, and because it is
in a draft format, we initially had the draft
included in this package but it is in final
clearance so we couldn't provide it as a
draft, draft.

However, when she met with us she
had indicated, and it was still in there. And
I believe that you could still access it on
the public comments, it's a public record.
And it includes the, we didn't use the term
confer, but it did include not consultation
with the 166 non-profit grantees, but it does
include that the Department would seek
advisement from the Indian and Native
American, this funding, training Council.
That is one of the mechanisms that's in place
in that policy.

So they didn't specifically
address, you know, consultation and what that
would look like for non-profits or non-tribal
entities, but it does clearly state that the
Department will consult with this body for
policy.

MR. WALDRON: So we could advise
the Secretary before she has her full
consultation meeting.

MS. CAMPBELL: Oh yes.

MR. WALDRON: That's how it came
down but it was not confirmed.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. And that is
in the policy. And that's what she had
discussed that you all recommended to her when
she came and met with you, this was almost a
year ago.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: So that's
already implemented?

MS. WHITMAN: No, it's the
proposed policy.

MS. CAMPBELL: It's actually not
proposed it's just in the final clearance for
signature, which means that it's gone through
all of the legal, I mean it's gone through
everything. Right, it's gone out to public
comment for the tracks fund, through
everything, both of them. It's just sitting in the final queue.

MS. WHITMAN: It was published April 18th.

MS. CAMPBELL: I'm not working on the policy. I was informed and he was formerly on our agenda, and I reached out to that office because he was our liaison, that it is in clearance.

MALE PARTICIPANT: Right, and we count clearance as the bad thing.

DR. STAPP: So is it going to be done before the election, would be important.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, it is important. That tribal consultation and making that point, it may be, it is a valid one to put in terms of priorities, following up, asking that question, and that's what we're there for.

MS. WHITMAN: Well, I'm looking at the Federal Register when it was published on April 18th and comments were supposed to be
received by June 18th.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right. And they got all those comments. They put it back out for the final information collection public comment, and it's cleared that as well.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: So it's sitting on somebody's desk.

MS. CAMPBELL: It is in final clearance.

MALE PARTICIPANT: At the back of the store, scratch and dent sale.

MR. WALDRON: So getting back to this thing here, so Group 2, we talked about, I know it was Group 2 not Priority 2, was the mission statement for the Advisory Board, how do you guys, where do you see that in the priority area?

MR. RICHARDSON: I mean when you talk about prioritizing, I mean, I thought we were just focusing on the projects for the next year.

MR. WALDRON: So that would be
just that one through five?

MR. RICHARDSON: Well yes, and the
seven, the seven here that we talked about.

MR. LEWIS: This one, this one,
this one, and then this one. These are all
duplication of some of the eight. And some of
them are on other topics, new Council and the
mission.

DR. STAPP: The mission statement,
it's important to have one. But as far as
making it a priority for the year, no.

(Crosstalk)

MR. RICHARDSON: There's already
one in something that I was looking at this
morning.

MS. MOLLE: The BearTracks.

DR. STAPP: I thought it was good,
the one we had.

MS. MOLLE: Updating the
BearTracks.

MS. CAMPBELL: That would be with
the education measure.
MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Molle, BearTracks? Did you indicate BearTracks as part of it?

MS. MOLLE: Thank you.

DR. STAPP: I have a question on Number 2, the TA, was just looking forward to training. So just for clarification, is that the same as TAT? And is that also including what we talked about on the transparency part, wanting the feedback and information about contract amounts and --

MR. WALDRON: I suspect it is because it seems to be avoiding the training and we've got to move contractor and how are we going to merge them together to get what we need for the betterment of our grantee?

DR. STAPP: So Michael, could you put a slash at the end of that, transparency, so that we get feedback and we know what to tell the rest of the grantees and how we're spending that one percent?

MR. LEWIS: It looks like there's
two different topics. And that's basically
the conferences, the TA support, the 477, the
national conference. And then Number 3 you
had the accountability, which is S-respondent?

DR. STAPP: Yes, that's something
different.

(Crosstalk)

MS. MOLLE: How did that 110,000,
whatever that is?

MR. WALDRON: We want transparency
through everything.

MR. LEWIS: Okay.

MALE PARTICIPANT: But
specifically about the one percent money.

MR. WALDRON: I think there should
be some priority on our legislative agenda, I
mean, what we spent this morning, a couple
hours this morning talking about. It's all
about --

DR. STAPP: I think it's more
important than Our Story. Our Story is
important but just under mission statement,
that's not going to change the way we do business or function as a Council.

And I really want us to focus more on the important things at hand, like the education end. We're going to be here for two and a half days and we've only reserved an hour to do Council work out of two and a half days. So I'd like to emphasize that we only meet twice a year, we should be more efficient in what we do instead of doing miscellaneous exercises.

MR. WALDRON: Well, let's move Our Story down and pronounce it Number 2. And maybe that may be action-oriented work for the Advisory Council on more important topics. Maybe 50 percent of our agenda will be full of Council action steps.

DR. STAPP: Right, because if you're saying it as a general statement to include whatever we happen to be working on, it's important for the Council and their time. Because that always needs to be a priority,
and when I feel that we're not prioritizing it enough.

We have the opportunity,
especially with the current Administration, to be the first Council that's effective in getting something done for all the grantees and servicing the Secretary. I'd hate to miss out on an opportunity by playing games.

MR. WALDRON: So do we want to put a percentage on our agenda, like 70 percent, 60, 80, 90, 100, I mean, just getting to what needs to be done, I'm all about getting the thing done.

MS. CARROLL: Well should that be Number 1?

DR. STAPP: Well does the Council agree?

MS. CARROLL: Definitely, I do. Should that be Number 1?

DR. STAPP: Yes, because it kind of --

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: It's going to
roll as --

MR. WALDRON: Put 70 percent in there, sure, 70 percent action items for the Council every time we get together.

MS. CARROLL: No less than.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, no less than 70 percent.

MR. WALDRON: No less than 70 percent, of action-oriented discussion or work. That's going to take more than two weeks in itself. Do you want to make that Number 1?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

DR. STAPP: We can make it Number 1 because it kind of covers everything as well.

MR. WALDRON: Yes, move them all down one. Very good, Michael.

MS. JAMES: I like it, it sounds good.

MS. CAMPBELL: For Number 2 can we spell out it's actually a training and
technical assistance contract now. It's not a grant.

MS. CARROLL: Well, I think we're talking about training and technical assistance in general.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, so training and technical, spell that out, training and technical assistance we need to be put TA so she'll know the difference, so she'll know exactly what we're getting at versus trying to keep up the contract.

MS. CARROLL: Not the contract, it's just the training, period.

MS. CAMPBELL: So training and technical assistance, that's it. You know, I'm wondering also, is that where there would be a sub-bullet of the training and technical assistance where we could request or get an update on the national conference? Because of course we have to go through and, as a program, put in a formal request to have that meeting. Is that the place where we give her
a heads up that it's coming through, the
importance of it?

MR. WALDRON: I don't know if it's
still is here or not, that there is a National
Chair as a position on the Council. It was
always part of it. I don't know if that got
removed with the restructuring it or not, or
how that, what happened.

I mean now, you happen to have it
because, you know, I'm here and on the Chair,
but I think in the past, the National Chair
always came and was part of the Report at
every Council meeting.

MS. CAMPBELL: That would be
positive and I guess we can always --

MR. WALDRON: That was always,
Lorenda, is that still in effect or did it
disappear?

MS. SANCHEZ: That disappeared
with the Bush Administration. We used to have
a spot for one, which was a coalition spot.

And the national conference had a spot.
were what they called ad hoc positions. And then we were told that they were not appropriate for the Council.

MR. WALDRON: Well, we can do that again, right?

MS. CAMPBELL: Or perhaps well, or consider having them speak or give them a speaking part via teleconference at a national conference for an update. Or right now, you're doing the next conference, we could start there and then see what happens because there's not a solid in.

Also, Troy keeps saying this but we're, there's going to be a change in Administration. So, you know, what we have in place now to carry us over potentially, until the next, that would be the calendar year, I think would be beneficial. So right now you could, you know, because you're the Chair, right, at the next conference. And you're on the Council, so it works.

MR. WALDRON: Right. So is it
possible, and maybe it's too early to tell in lieu of what's going on, to push for the national conference that goes into the new Administration as part of our structure that it happens all the time? You know, I was talking to Margaret Zetec, and I don't want to get into another topic right now, about merging 477 and 166 national conference together and making it one big conference. Well maybe there's an opportunity to get that started tomorrow, you know --

MS. CAMPBELL: I think that would be beneficial, that one as a Council we are a part of our training and technical assistance. One of the proposals is to give her, or make her aware that a formal request for this meeting, for the national meeting is forthcoming, that work's being done to partner with, you know, the Bureau of Indian Affairs 477 Program, that you're working on it. We don't have to have it finalized, but just so she'll know.
And the reason why I say that is because I'm going to have to submit that formal package. And if she knows that it's coming and is a part of something she talked to you about as a technical assistance agreement, she's ultimately going to approve it or disapprove it before it goes on to the Secretary's office. But, you know, the package itself. And if they were not familiar with the package, that could be another example. But I didn't want to go with the package itself.

MS. WHITMAN: Oh, I'm sorry, okay.

Councilwoman Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I have a question. Every year we do a budget recommendation on, I believe it's the one -- and each area includes an amount including national conference as well as an amount for the 477 conference as well as an amount for the regional conferences. We had one in place for this year.
I guess I'm still confused on how the request for the regional conference was denied, considering that it was in the approved, I assume it was an approved budget recommendation. And it was a recommendation of this Council that we invite them. And it's for the one percent money, which is grantee money to begin with. I'm still confused on how all that came about and how that's the whole situation.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well I can, we're going to go in public comment and we could probably carry it on. But to answer your question, and I'll answer until 2:00, if someone could tell me that.

What occurred in April, last year when we came together we put the TAT in place, at which time the decision was made by the Department that the funds would not be put into a grant. Under the grant process, we laid out the TAT expenditures. And then we would have the dollar amounts. That's the
grant.

It is now a contract, which is
totally, you can appreciate this, a contract
is very different. And those deliverables
that we requested, there's no dollar amount
there. But the activities and the tasks are
in the contract, one. And how did that --

MS. CARROLL: Who came up with
those activities? Was that not part of
recommendations from the Council?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, the activities
themselves. That's where I got the activities
from verbatim, verbatim. They don't have the
dollar amounts associated with them in the
contract. So that answers that portion.

MS. CARROLL: What about regional
conference?

MS. CAMPBELL: Moneys for
conferences, and it says regional, doesn't say
specifically Eastern, Midwest, it says
regional conferences and a national
conference. The money is there.
So in the event that they approve it or disapprove it, doesn't mean that, and also too, I think it's really, really important to note, anyone who sat on that national committee for the conference, can appreciate this. And there's only the guidance for the clearance, there's now a clearance process which is for the Office of Management and Budget. There is an Executive Order that is accessible.

I believe that some of the members also sat in on a presentation that the Office Management and Budget did provide, that directed the secretaries of every department to implement policy regarding a conference request, they call it, a conference request. Every federal agency, ETA, probably put the most stringent guidelines, stringent in that they're very detailed oriented in terms of specifically what we had to deliver, okay?

Initially the guidance, and it's not guidance to the 166 community, it's
guidance from the Secretary's office to her Assistant Secretaries. It's not guidance from Assistant Secretary to the grantee community. That's why we don't have a memo.

But we can continue, now this is really important and I think it's really important information so when we go and talk more, but, and I'm sure we're going to get some public comment on that process. So we now will --

MS. WHITMAN: It is very, very important that we continue this discussion after public comment. And so being 2:00, we are now moving to public comment session. And would the individuals please state your name and who you are representing?

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, and before we go forward --

MS. WHITMAN: Oh sure.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay. And before actually we get started, I do want to give just a little bit of updated information. And
we talked about this yesterday regarding the
purpose and the process, you know, for public
comment.

Public comment is the process in
which the Department of Labor as well as the
Council receives comment from the public
regarding the 166 program or items that are of
concern that would affect Indian and Native
Americans. It is a public comment section.

We, as a Council, or myself specifically as
the designated federal officer, will not
provide a response to the public comment.

However, and this is something
that we're going to work on in partnership
with the Council, is that once we deliver it
under our action-oriented work, specifically
to address this matter, the Department as well
as the Council will provide written feedback
on all public comment.

Please note that any public
comment or question specifically addressed to
the Department of Labor will require, as
public comment will require clearance. So it won't be as timely.

So please, when you come up and address the Council or provide your comment, if you have questions, specific questions, state that clearly so that we know to provide a written response to that question.

Also, if you have a question for the Council, that's a totally different process. But if the response, again, entails any kind of feedback from the U.S. Department of Labor, that will have to be cleared. We're going to identify, the response will be as timely as we can afford.

I know that under the Information Collection and the Freedom of Information, it's the minimum of 30 to 60 days. So I'm not going to put a time frame on it but certainly we are going to implement that as a body.

Also, please note that we are prohibited to engage in a dialogue with individuals who are bringing forth their
public comments. But we will provide a
response to any questions proposed to this
committee or U.S. Department of Labor in a
timely fashion. So with that, we thank you
for your attendance and we will open up
formally for public comment.

MS. BROWN: Bob and I were going
to draw straws. Good afternoon, I'm Athena
Brown. Thank you for the opportunity to
provide public comment.

I am here today as a member of the
public. And I know that many of you know me
through my work in federal government over the
years in Washington, D.C., but I now live and
work back in Carson City, Nevada.

And I want to make sure that for
the record, I am not providing a statement
representing any particular branch of federal
government, I am representing myself.

I am an enrolled member of the
Fort McDermitt, Paiute, Shoshone Tribe on the
northern border of Nevada or Oregon. The
reservation is remote and the nearest town is located approximately 74 miles away, so you can imagine the isolation.

This is my statement of record for support of the Department of Labor's Indian and Native American Program, the legislative history of which is longstanding. And although this program shows commonalities with many other federal programs, it stands unique in its own respect.

Understanding the relationship between the federal government and the Native Americans is really the key to the success of the Workforce Investment System and their ability to serve this population.

The Workforce Investment Act provides for this program to be administered in a manner consistent with the Indian Self-Determination Act, defined, it supports the unique and continuing federal relationship with Indian people. It provides for Indian participation in their own government and
education of the people.

    And most importantly, it supports
the right of tribes and tribal organizations
to determine the administration and management
of their own program in a culturally relevant
manner, should they desire.

    I would like to recognize the
Native American Employment and Training
Council for their commitment and their role in
this respect. Throughout the years, the
Advisory Council, also mandated by law, has
provided guidance and technical assistance,
reporting, and performance measures that
support the special characteristics of the
Indian and Native American communities they
serve. And they have made their expertise
available to federal policy-makers. I think
that's very important.

    I recognize the importance of
their role now more than ever, because I'm out
there in the communities and I'm working with
the Nevada populations and the tribes in
Nevada. I feel sometimes very far removed from the policies and the politics of Washington, D.C., and I think that many of you can recognize that.

Time and time again you hear testimonials from distinguished tribal leaders, directors, and other Native Americans in the workplace, some of whom serve our Indian communities in many different professions. But they've received training and/or their educational opportunities through the assistance of the Indian and Native American Workforce.

Their foot in the door, so to speak, has been through the assistance of this program. I, myself, was a participant in this program and this program has greatly influenced my life. I started out my career in Washington, D.C. through the assistance of this program. So I am very pleased that I can get up and share my perspectives with you, and the many opportunities afforded through the
Indian and Native American Programs.

In Nevada, we face many challenges including the highest unemployment rate in the nation. There are 25 reservations, Indian colonies, and bands dispersed throughout the state.

Since moving back I have acclimated myself back to the ways of rural Nevada. Distance is measured in time. And your workload in these communities are planned by your time and by resources. There is no easy way to serve some of these communities.

Gas prices have gone through the roof and there are no means for public transportation. Nevada's reservations are served through the Intertribal Council of Nevada, one of your grantees. It's a small team of staff that make their rounds to each reservation throughout the state to provide services such as recruitment, application, community development, and networking. The hours are long and demanding.
The accomplishments and outcomes are not always measured by numbers and percentages, but rather by the differences you make in the quality of life in these communities. To achieve success in the most difficult areas requires a bit of flexibility, and I'm not telling you anything you don't already know.

Educational degrees and training in these areas are needed and are of great importance to the future of Indian people. I believe unless we make those investments in our Indian communities, our futures will not be directed or managed by those who truly have a vested interest or can make good, sound decisions because they won't know or understand Indian country.

There are many exciting career paths available, including social services, managing trust lands, natural resources, rangeland management, fire management, operation of irrigation systems, fish and
wildlife, environmental, economic development, law enforcement, legal, paralegal, information technology, and it goes on.

There are a lot of people who are out of work and struggling to find jobs. The Indian and Native American Programs are important. They inspire hope, they provide awareness of the opportunities available.

While the role of government has changed significantly in the last three decades, the tribes in the last three decades, making a greater emphasis on Indian self-governance and self-determination, the tribes still look up to the programs like the Indian and Native American Programs for a broad range of services.

We no longer have an option to avoid using computers. The individuals that lack the skills navigating through job search functions on computers are lost. Or if you can't apply for a job through U.S.A. Jobs, you're not considered. Simply directing
clients to a kiosk is not enough.

I recently assisted someone who had been out of work for quite some time. He was in the construction trade. And I became very frustrated with navigating through the automated workforce system. I know a little bit about computers. Can you imagine construction workers, laborers, or other professions who are not computer literate?

It's very, very difficult.

Working with programs such as Indian and Native American Programs is an option that can benefit both the employee and the employer, and those seeking jobs. The programs that I have seen provide personal intervention, creative planning, and commitment to getting the unemployed employed.

President Obama indicated in his first State of the Union that his priorities would focus on the economy and job creation, and on promoting innovation, new technologies, and education.
There have been similar efforts in the past that focused on building the economy through various initiatives. But to me, the difference is in the way that our Indian and Native American Programs approach the training and education of Indians, and the strategies that we employ to make sure that our populations are not excluded.

I will always support the efforts of the Department of Labor, the Indian and Native Americans, to recruit, train, and educate potential applicants. To me, it's an investment, it's a commitment. We must change with the times, we must challenge the system, and learn from our critics. This is all about serving people, getting jobs through whatever means it takes.

And I always hope that I can contribute in some small way, even if it's by providing this public comment today. Thank you.

MS. WHITMAN: Thank you.
MR. KELLAM: My name is Bob Kellam, K-E-L-L-A-M. I'm Employment and Training Director for the Florida Governor's Council on Indian Affairs, Incorporated.

I'm able to travel here, not on our grant funds, but on money provided to the Governor's Council by the Mikasuki Tribe of Indians of Florida and the Seminole Tribe of Florida. I'm not here representing them, but their generosity made it able that I don't have to take the money out of the grant in order to travel here.

I don't have very many comments, really, I have a lot of questions which I guess I'm not going to get answers to today, right, from what you just said? You're not going to answer that, either.

Most of you are probably familiar with what has come about concerning a regional conference or multi-regional conference for the East and Midwest I think. There was a committee, the planning committee has been
meeting for at least six months.

And in June, this is the way I understand it, a request was sent in for $30,000 of training and technical assistance money. And that was in June. The conference committee didn't hear anything, and in fact, at their last planning meeting, they said well, we're not going to get this money. So they went ahead and planned the conference, that it could be paid for out of their registration fees.

And then I think it was just last week they got a memo, or a memo was sent out, denying the request for the funds and cancelling the conference. And it said that the $2,000 exceeded allowable cost per participant and the guide, you know, where are the guidelines for allowable costs? I mean, it is evidently, there are some guidelines that are written down somewhere.

One of the people from one of the grantees had a conversation with their
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regional, the Dallas Regional Administrator. And that person was told that, he was asked for a copy of the policy, or the policy of the guidelines, or a copy of the guidelines. And he told this person that he wasn't going to give it to her because it doesn't apply to them.

In other words, because these guidelines don't apply to the grantees, I guess he's saying, then you can't have a copy of them. So one thing, I'm asking for a copy. And I don't know this, I haven't seen this in writing, but a lot of people from grantees that told me, told Joe, that they were told that if they used their own money to go to the conference, that that could be a disallowed cost. So the OMB guidelines that were sent out, I'm going to read this for you.

"Conference expenses are defined as all direct and indirect conference costs paid by the government, whether paid directly by Agencies or reimbursed by Agencies to
travelers, or others associated with the conference. But, do not include funds paid under federal grants to grantees."

Okay, now that's what I call crystal clear, black and white, with a yellow highlighting, American English. I really don't think that that leaves itself to any kind of misinterpretation, it's a clear statement.

Now I guess that this request for the funds made this some kind of Department of Labor conference, all right? But as we have done, you know, I've been with this program for 35 years and I don't know how many times the grantees haven't gotten together and they charge a registration fee and all the costs of the conferences and everything were paid out of that money. It was like an entrepreneurial thing.

And what I'm wondering is, is that no longer possible, you know? If the conference committee had not asked for this
money then, well, the conference would have
gone on. And because they also had
commitments from all the facilitators, same
facilitators that have been used for years and
years, that they would do this and present
workshops and whatever, for free.

And so the conference committee
said well, then we can go ahead and do this,
you know, whether we get the money from Labor
or not. So I just want to make sure, I want
to get an answer that, in other words,
grantees can still do that. They can still
get together, plan a conference that will
involve only grantee funds and that those
funds will not end up being disallowed costs,
you know, it's a yes or no.

And I'm also requesting, Angie,
that you provide a copy of these guidelines to
the grantees. Now, I'll tell you that Joe and
I are going to get a copy of the guidelines.
We have Senator Bill Nelson, he'll get it for
us or we can go through Freedom of Information
Action or something like that. But we're going to have them.

And I hope the Department doesn't embarrass us by not giving us a copy, so that the next time I come here, I'll have the minutes of this meeting in one hand and a copy of the policies in the other hand and Labor's saying no, you can't have those, right? I doubt it will happen but I've seen stranger things happen.

I also want to talk about BearTracks. Now Terry Clark from our office sent out an email to, probably to all of you, everybody, including the people that he thought were on the IT Committee. And there's some issues with BearTracks because of the new Windows and this, that, and the other, asking, you know, what's going to be done about it?

Now I understand our new contractor just came onboard and I hope that for one thing, we can discuss this with them and that all those questions will be answered
and that technical assistance with the BearTracks program and adding the new performance standard and anything and everything else will be taken care of in pretty short order.

Now for many, many years, I don't even know how many, but the Florida Governor's Council on Indian Affairs, Incorporated, we provided the services of Terrence Clark and also on numerous occasion we provided, we have 30 laptops that we purchased and we keep up for our Florida Indian Youth Program. And we have used those at many national and multi-regional conferences.

For a long time, we never got reimbursed anything for any of that. We finally got an agreement with CIMC as the contractor and we were paid a certain amount per conference and we supplied all 30 computers and Terry Clark and all of his money, and the amount varied sometimes but we got that.
And I've got to tell you that we're not going to do that again unless we're going to get paid. We just can't now, we used to have a kind of a luxury as far as our employment and training funds. Well, that luxury has disappeared and so we're pinching pennies just like everybody else now.

And Terry spends a whole lot of time working on this, thinking about it, make sure that he keeps out in front of all the issues that may come up along with Jennifer from California.

And he also spends a lot of time on the phone answering grantee's questions because everybody knows that if you have a question about BearTracks, you call Terry, right?

Now for a long time, I didn't think about it. But recently I've told him, I said from now on you need to keep track of the calls and keep track of the time. And I think that, and I hope we can work this out,
but we're going to have to be reimbursed for
the time he spends doing this, okay?

I think that's all, let me make
sure I've asked all these questions. Just
again, to make it clear, I want to know if the
rules and regulations that apply in this
conference, a memo and everything, that apply
to Department of Labor Agencies and personnel,
does that apply to the grantees? You know,
you should be able to give me a yes or no
answer. So I want to thank everybody for
their time and I appreciate it.

MS. WHITMAN: Thank you, Bob.

MS. CAMPBELL: In the interim,
until we receive another public comment, I
just want to reiterate to make sure that the
Department of Labor, of least for the record,
have the three questions that was proposed.
And we will provide a written response to the
Florida Governor's Council attention Mr.
Kellam.

The first question was a request
for a copy of the policy that was issued from the Secretary of Labor to the Assistant Secretaries of Labor.

Also, two, specifically what are the guidelines regarding allowable cost? A response will be provided for that as well. And then three, as a team, we will identify the OMB circular, Craig, as a deliverable.

And the third question that I received for the record is if the WIA Section 166 community does not seek to use Labor fundings, for example, the training and technical assistance one percent, can a conference still happen? Can grantees still plan and host a meeting without Department of Labor approval?

MR. RICHARDSON: Madam Chair?

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, Councilman Richardson.

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you.

Because of concerns that have been brought to my attention from grantees along the same
lines of those questions that were just asked, I think it, I'd be curious to know relative to these policies, are grantees restricted as far as their participation and attendance at other conferences and activities, state workforce development conferences that are operated by the states, or regional association conferences by other entities that, for example, the National Association of Workforce Development Professionals, any conference that they'd have. Is there a restriction? I think it would be important in answering these questions that those issues be responded to as well.

MS. WHITMAN: I would like to give an example, a recent example of a state WIA conference in Hawaii that I, my staff and I participated in. It was a three day and this was last week. And the consultant was from SPRE and all of the partners of the WIA system, Alumni Kay, other non-profits, and all of the state entities all participated and
they came in from different islands, from the mainland, and I assume travel and everything was paid for.

So I don't know what the difference is with that versus the Indian and Native American Programs having their conferences. Yes, Councilman Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Well I guess, there's been no, as far as you're aware of, there's no issuance regarding attendance at that type of activity.

MS. WHITMAN: We're still in public comment, Angie said. But I was responding to your question. Bob, continue?

MR. KELLAM: I'm still Bob Kellam. The Department of Labor, and I don't remember how long ago this was, but they decided that they were going to take one percent of the money appropriated to the grantees and use that for training and technical assistance.

And I want to know, does that same procedure or technique, is that applied by the
Department of Labor to the states? Do they get one percent of their money taken away for training and technical assistance? Because, you know, I have a Masters in Public Administration, I've learned a little bit about government. And, you know, Departments exist to provide assistance to their constituent, whoever they might be. In this way, to grantees. And they get money appropriated from Congress in order to, you know, be a department and take care of all the things that they're supposed to take care of.

And I don't understand why Labor takes one percent of our grant money to use for something they already are getting paid to do. I don't know, am I making sense now?

Okay, so I think Labor ought to end that policy and pay for the technical assistance out of their own funds, just like they do for everyone else, and like all the other departments in government that I know of.
MS. WHITMAN: Thank you, Bob.

MS. SANCHEZ: Winona?

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, Lorenda?

MS. SANCHEZ: Are we still in public comment?

MS. WHITMAN: Yes we are.

MS. SANCHEZ: I would like to offer public comment on behalf of Ms. Jennifer Whitmore, from California Indian Manpower Consortium.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: Third party public comment can not be provided.

MS. SANCHEZ: Okay, then I'll read her concerns myself then.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, for the process, the comments from Jennifer Whitmore, it did in the Federal Register indicate that public comment could have been provided in writing to me by two days before this meeting. We can also email it now and we could read it. We will receive them. The comments can be
emailed to Mike Delaney, we'll read them for
the record. However, we cannot take third
party public comment.

MS. SANCHEZ: Okay, I will offer
public comment on behalf of the California
Indian Manpower Consortium, Lorenda Sanchez,
Executive Director.

And the three concerns that I am
going to present all relate to BearTracks and
the BearTracks update request, all which have
been forwarded not only to the workgroup but
to the Department of Labor. And since the
Council meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico in
2010, there has been a concern about the
upgrades and fixes that are needed for our
BearTracks reporting software.

And the recommendations include
that the importance of BearTracks as our
reporting mechanism to the Department of
Labor, need not be overlooked. And when we
think about our priorities, the reporting
system needs to be collecting adequately and
sufficiently all the program related data so that the work that we're doing is communicated effectively and being recorded in full to the Department and then on to Congress and the public.

And we feel it's an opportune time as we are looking at creating new educational reports, in line with the proposed education measure that we also look at the elements in BearTracks that are collected so that the program is selecting the data and providing the training and the software development that is needed to have an effective reporting system for the Indian and Native American Program.

There are currently 36 reports that are available in BearTracks, of which five reports are not working. And there are 16 reports that need some type of modifications for enhancement. Those reporting datas need to be considered as a priority for our current program reporting,
particularly in the youth program area.

And we will revisit the youth data collected once the IT Workgroup has an opportunity to meet and formulate recommendations to our contractor, which is the next area of concern, as Mr. Kellam had mentioned, Mr. Clark at Florida Governor's Council has been engaging in dialogue with the grantee community.

There isn't a day that goes by that Jennifer Whitmore in the JMC Office is not either on the phone or through email, in communication with a grantee that is having some challenges with BearTracks.

We do appreciate the Department of Labor, DINAP, and the former contractor HEITECH for allowing Terry and Jennifer to have the patches to be able to continue to provide some support to the grantees without a contractor in place. But it is a time consuming technical assistance that's offered.

I have let Jennifer know that she
is to continue to provide that technical
assistance and training to any grantee that
needs help. And she does make it a priority.

I believe, as she does, that
BearTracks collects and reports our program
demographics, our services and our performance
results. And that is critical to how this
program is viewed by all of the stakeholders.

But I also believe that as a
Program Manager, if I didn't have the blessing
of a staff person like Jennifer on my team, I
probably wouldn't have access to the number of
reports that she's able to generate. But it
takes a certain level of skill to manipulate
the system right now to get those reports
done. And it shouldn't be that way.

So I would respectfully ask that
the Council in the deliberations and
prioritizing of our plans for program year '12
and moving into PY '13, that we get a
contractor in place to work with the IT
Workgroup and Recording Workgroup on the
enhancements and fixes that are needed, and that we look at how that program, or even explore new programming if necessary, to incorporate the education measure. This is the ideal time.

And we also need to remember that technology for today, as we, you know, have it, it's probably already being changed somewhere in the world. And most recently it's been shared that with Windows and Microsoft releases that are on the horizon, our system is definitely going to be in need of some updates.

So I appreciate the time that I'm able to share with the Council, the importance of our BearTracks or whatever reporting system we have for our program, be considered for this next program year. Thank you.

MS. WHITMAN: Thank you, Lorenda.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, for the record, thank you for the comments. We did not receive any official questions that will
require response from the Department of Labor,
from California Indian Manpower Consortium,
comments, deliverables, suggestions to the
Council, but not any questions.

MS. WHITMAN: There was a request.

MS. CAMPBELL: There was a
request, but that's a request but not a formal
response needed to a question in public
comment, but a request.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman
Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you, Madam
Chair. Angie, were there other written
comments submitted prior to this meeting that
were submitted as public comments or requests?

MS. CAMPBELL: No, I would have
them available here at this meeting.

MR. RICHARDSON: Okay.

MS. CAMPBELL: There was no public
comment submitted, emailed, or received by the
Department of Labor.

MR. RICHARDSON: Okay.
MS. WHITMAN: That request was to ask the Council to prioritize to get a contractor in place on enhancements and fixes in the new program to incorporate the education measure. Councilman Waldron?

MR. WALDRON: While we are waiting for public comment people to show up, can we continue to work on the priority lists?

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, yes we can.

MR. WALDRON: Because it's so quiet in here, we're all looking at each other.

MS. WHITMAN: Okay, all right. We will continue our prioritization that's listed on the Power Point.

MR. WALDRON: Where did we end up, Our Story?

MS. CAMPBELL: We are officially stepped out of public comment, we've got it for the record, right?

MS. WHITMAN: We have officially stepped out of public comment until there is
another speaker.

MR. WALDRON: We step back in when somebody else comes in, that's how it works?

MS. WHITMAN: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. So actually, there is, I just wanted to, and this is not for public comment record, is we had the TAT contractor introduced this morning, they have procured the contract for the services with HEITECH work on BearTracks to include the education measure. That's part of the tasks also is included in here, it's in the deliverables in the tasks.

It's not specifically lined out but it is a deliverable under technology and assistance for the scope of work for our new contract. So we did hear that before and it is included and they will start work as soon as it's officially issued, the moneys.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: One of the projects
that we had included in our list over there
was to update software whether its BearTracks
or other. And I think certainly that we
include these in our top five as well,
considering that we have to incorporate the
information for the education measure as well
as the problems that grantees are currently
having with concurrences.

MS. WHITMAN: And also, that has a
bearing on what, like how the reports are
coming out and being shared with Congress and
the rest of the Department.

MS. CARROLL: Absolutely.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Stapp?

DR. STAPP: Well we have a new
contractor that's going to have its contract
with BearTracks but then everybody's making
motions to change BearTracks. Should we spend
money to update BearTracks if we're going to
try to change it and upgrade it?

MS. CAMPBELL: One more time.

MS. WHITMAN: Could you please --
DR. STAPP: Okay. So my question is, we have a new contractor onboard and one of their tasks is to update BearTracks with the education measure. But all of our other recommendations are to change BearTracks. So should we spend the money and the time updating BearTracks if we want to change it out, or wait until we go to a new system?

The other part is we're still not clear on what the education measure is and how it's going to be implemented. I think we need to have a full discussion on what's coming down as far as education measure before we can put it into BearTracks as a deliverable.

MS. CAMPBELL: And that's the strategy that we were attempting to fulfill, at least on our end regarding the education measure that we hope that we have some dialogue on that, exactly what that means. But in terms of the task order, the BearTracks system, their first order is one, is to get the technical assistance in
place, meaning that to re-subcontract just like CIMC did under the grant with HEITECH to ensure that that TA that Jennifer Whitmore is providing and Terry Clark has been providing, and I am, the Department of Labor is very grateful as well as Duane Hall has also been providing a lot of TA in the interim of when the grant, at least the grant from CIMC expired until now. We are very grateful for that.

But that's the first task, as soon as they can issue the order. And we're going to actually, also I was talking to the contractor, is that's where we're going to start.

And then yes, as a subtest, that's a very good idea, Dr. Stapp, is that first we should first know what the education measure is before we start making decisions about changing BearTracks.

But it is needed, and I noted that it is a deliverable that we've talked about as
a Council for several years, about the need of BearTracks. And I've heard it, I've heard it. But to get a formal recommendation, and a formal strategy, and a really formal what it is that needs to be changed and really what it is we need to do, it's going to be the next step after we get a good understanding about the education measure.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Richardson?

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes, I guess this question, I guess, Angie, is for you. Do you know when the HEITECH contract expires? And if it is expiring, how are we looking at fulfilling a new contract?

MS. CAMPBELL: HEITECH never had a contract with the Department of Labor. They were subcontracting with CIMC.

MS. RICHARDSON: Oh.

MS. CAMPBELL: In the PY 2010, this is how HEITECH explained it to me, those funds actually expended on June 31st of this
program year. So from June 31st of this program year until to date, we have not had a contractor in place because we went from the grantee to an 8(a). We have an 8(a) now. We also have engaged HEITECH for the continuation of services. They will, and we're going to set up a meeting, will continue that for consistency, it's the subcontract with, well, we, but they have to do the logistics of it.

MS. RICHARDSON: Under the new contract.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. And that's actually stipulated specifically, and they're aware of that because HEITECH is the most familiar contractor. Right now I don't get to negotiations, specifically what they're going to contract, but that is one of the elements we're going to work on for that consistency, is to have HEITECH available.

Also too, HEITECH does also do contract work with the Cherokee Nation. And for a period of time, it was 30 days, they had
additional funding. The Cherokee Nation did
provide money in the HEITECH grant to provide
support to the 166 community.

I'm not certain if they were, so they were available, if the grantees contacted
them, the Cherokee Nation did, and they had additional money, they have a blanket contract with the Department of Labor. So they also helped fill the gap, so it was CIMC, Terry from Florida Governor's also provided technical support, and Duane Hall.

But there was no contract in place, no verbal agreement of payment, we can't do that with federal funds. However, my understanding was, well, it was stated to me it was volunteer. I certainly know that my staff did it voluntarily.

And I know that the Cherokee Nation did cover under a blanket agreement with the Department of Labor because they have a technical assistance grant with the Department. They also put extra funding they
had available for the effort. But that was discontinued October 1st.

MS. RICHARDSON: Well I guess my point is, I was trying to find out because I know that my staff and other people that I heard, grantees have called Terry forever. This has been going on for a long time, and Jennifer. It didn't just start in June and it didn't just start in October. So I guess my question is, you're saying HEITECH is the most familiar with BearTracks. Is that what you're saying?

MS. CAMPBELL: What I'm saying is, is that HEITECH has been the identified subcontractor for programming issues so far, and I'm not a technological person. I can take your question and I can certainly provide a written response in terms of programming, reprogramming the system. That's different than providing technical assistance and guidance, two different areas there.

MS. RICHARDSON: Because I was
asking the question because of the public
comment about Terrence Clark providing
technical assistance. And I know he's been
doing that forever, as a volunteer, I guess.
And I was just trying to ascertain if there,
if this was going out to bids to the other
contractor, that's all. But you've already --

MS. CAMPBELL: Well for the
record, what we can do, and the contractor is
here, but it is in a contract, that
deliverable to provide technical assistance
for the BearTracks is in the contract, the
8(a) contract.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman
Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: So does that mean
that the new contractor will be providing that
technical assistance rather than Jennifer and
Terry? Is that --

MS. CAMPBELL: Not necessarily.

It is our intent and I hope, it's my hope that
we would be able to continue to partner with CIMC, I mean, that's consistency of service to partner if there is a cost associated with it, then they would have to subcontract with CIMC for example, or with Florida Governor. And if not, if that's not available, then it's, but I'm not a contractor.

So the specifics, I would hope that we could set that up. And that's what we would work toward achieving, but to say that's, you know, they're primarily responsible for making sure we have technical assistance for that BearTracks system.

DR. STAPP: I'm sorry, so they would contract with CIMC and Florida to continue the BearTracks support? Who were you saying if on the subcontract with CIMC and Florida?

MS. CAMPBELL: I can say, no, I'm not saying that they will or will subcontract with CIMC or Florida Governor's --

DR. STAPP: Or anyone.
MS. CAMPBELL: Or anyone, for that matter. We would have to, I mean, they're in the beginning stages. One of the tasks that I did ask the contractor and they agreed to do, was to make sure that we had technical assistance for the BearTracks.

We haven't, I know right now, to provide the technical assistance minimally, until we come up with a full strategy, and I don't want to put a contractor on line, but right now they're not even, that they haven't been officially, they have been awarded the contract but they haven't received the funding yet so they'll get it, Monday will be the official, the awarding date.

So to really go into detail specifically on what they're going to do and who they're going to subcontract with, I think it is premature. But nonetheless, that is our goal.

DR. STAPP: So speaking generally though, I guess what I was getting at to is,
if they have to subcontract with whoever it
is, is that a different kind of third party
contracting than what we were talking about
earlier that's disallowed?

MS. CAMPBELL: It's different

because one is a subcontract, but there's no,
you're not allowed to do third party billing
for travel. It's very different than
subcontracting for a task. So travel, and I'm
not a contracting officer, I'm not a
contracting officer.

DR. STAPP: Okay.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman

Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you.

Angie, did I understand you to say that the
agreement to retain HEITECH is in place with
the new technical assistance contract, that
they will be continued, HEITECH? Or does the
contractor have the option, following what you
were talking about, Rod, have the option to
select the contractor, potentially select a
Native American contractor on their own. So it's not in the required --

MS. CAMPBELL: Exact statement of work, right, absolutely. And for example, and if you read the statement of work, I'm going to look at the statement, it doesn't say specifically HEITECH services. It is our plan for the bridge to do just that.

I mean, we've talked as a Council, so to answer your question specifically, there is nothing that prohibits our new 8(a) contractor to conduct business with another subcontractor. There's nothing that prohibits them from doing that, they can do just that. But for consistency of service, meaning that who's currently operating it, that was a suggestion. There's nothing mandates for them to do that.

DR. STAPP: Is there anything that saying they should use, buy Indian preferences?

MS. CAMPBELL: Indian preferences?
DR. STAPP: Buy Indian programs?

MS. CAMPBELL: No, nothing in the contract or the statement of work says that they should subcontract with Indian, that's not required. We're required by statute to contract, if we're going to put it in a contract, with an Indian and Native American organization, but nothing in the regulation says that that contract has to subcontract with an Indian or Native American organization so no, I didn't put that stipulation in the contract.

DR. STAPP: Can we do that as a preference, just state it as a preference?

MS. CAMPBELL: Not now, that contract will be awarded on Monday.

DR. STAPP: But it's not signed yet.

MS. CAMPBELL: It's pretty much a done deal, it's just not, we haven't allocated the funds. The contract will be, or at least that's not officially awarded because they're...
MALE PARTICIPANT: And it's one year too.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, and it's one year and so there's always, it's a one year optional.

DR. STAPP: Well what does that mean then?

MS. CAMPBELL: That means that the LID will administer this contract, this 8(a) contract, as agreed upon for one year.

DR. STAPP: Okay, that I know.

MS. CAMPBELL: So that's what that means.

DR. STAPP: I know what that means. But what I was getting at is why do we say oh, it's just for one year. So that's putting off using the Indian preference for one year. I'd like to see an Indian company be used if at all possible. I mean, it's just good business for Indian companies. Does anybody have any objections to that?
(Off microphone discussion)

MS. CAMPBELL: The contract and the statement of work is complete for this program year. I mean the contractor is here, I know that they've been here for the process, I know that they hear your comments and suggestions, but in terms of modifying the agreement that is in place, and that the contract that will be awarded, it's too late to do that. But they're here and they hear the recommendations.

DR. STAPP: Okay, I mean I'm glad they are.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, yes, right.

DR. STAPP: But I want to continue that trend as a preference.

MS. CAMPBELL: And I think we all would like to do that.

MS. WHITMAN: Congresswoman Molle?

MS. MOLLE: Yes, I guess I need some clarifications. Right now, today, if a grantee needs some technical assistance with
BearTracks, which is an ongoing daily thing, who should they call?

MALE PARTICIPANT: To be put on hold.

MS. CAMPBELL: No, you may call, and we've been, this is the identified task that was in the performance elements of my staff, call Duane Hall or Guy Suetopka, if you want a guaranteed deliverable because Duane, that's part of his task and it is --

MS. MOLLE: That's who we're supposed to call until further notice.

MS. CAMPBELL: Correct. And it sounds like then if that would be beneficial, we could send out an email. Guy will put it on the community practice, and I believe that we did do that. We did that, actually I'm going to take it back because we did do it because we had this long discussion of how we were going to fill the gap as a team, thank you, Craig.

And so an email did go out, it is
on the community practice. Duane Hall has more than enough skill to provide the technical assistance. And he has done that above and beyond his duties so far, so that, to answer your question, Duane Hall or Guy Suetopka.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, recap some of Rod's comments, I am tickled pink that we have a North Carolina Indian entity that's been awarded the technical assistance contract here. And congratulations to, from the Economic Development and LRDA on that.

But I think for the future, you know, I think we and the Indian community would appreciate seeing part of the specs or the, what do you call the specs for the contract before it's let, have some reference or preference for Indian contracting within the community.

And I know that once a contract is
awarded, you can't go and tell the contractor, you know, these add on things of here's, we want to throw these things in now and, you know, it's the contractor's prerogative to contract with who they, you know, find will best provide their services I think, you know. But I think in the future, you know, we can express that, you know, we have a preference or we'd like to see that in the contractor's piece.

MS. WHITMAN: Could this have been discussed with the Council on a teleconference, and emailed information sense, on the job statement works?

MS. CAMPBELL: I'm not a contract officer and I'm not going to present like I am a contract officer. But what I can do, we have a one year contract in place. Yes, I made the decision without, as formal consultation not that, I mean, to the Council for the contract agreement, and for that I stand corrected.
However, I also, as the Division Chief, have to make decisions for the program as a whole. And I decided as the Chief, to put the contract in place. One request that I did hear from the Council, and that was to make sure that that entity was Indian or Native American, that's what I've heard last time.

What I can do and I will do, is at the next meeting, is I can ask, especially if it's not here I'll get someone from the Regional Office, a contracting officer, because I don't know the requirements, the legal requirements of contracting. I know how to put one in place now, but I certainly don't want to, you know, misstate what is allowable or not allowable under the contract.

But certainly, we will have someone so if there are questions, especially when there's a new contract coming up, that you all can ask those questions specifically of a contract manager, because what their job...
is, is to make sure that there's a legal agreement between those two entities. And we managed just the purchase orders that comes in and goes out.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Waldron?

MR. WALDRON: Getting back to the priority sheet --

MS. WHITMAN: All right, getting back to our priorities.

MR. WALDRON: I wanted to, because I think, number one, we probably need to put slash Secretary as well, because she probably has, I mean, we are her Advisory Board and she may have specific duties for us, but we become part of that 70 percent. Well, or he, right now it's a she but I've got my little pink ribbon over there, I'm going to give it to Elk because he was tickled pink.

MS. WHITMAN: Also, after our meeting has ended, I would like to make a suggestion, recommendation that Michael send out the draft that's been in the Power Point
as is, without any edits, just so we have a framework of our total discussion today.

    MR. WALDRON: And I wanted to, because I did kind of forget picking up Christine's comment, we did talk about trying to work partnership through better and work together with 477 and 166, as one of the priorities.

    MS. CARROLL: Not be separate entities.

    MR. WALDRON: Not be separate entities but work together so that we can come together as we service our communities better. And that has to be put up on the table and discussed, but I know that the energy's in that direction, right?

    FEMALE PARTICIPANT: I have a question for you. Is 477 under the same directive that we are on our conferences?

    MR. WALDRON: Well, when I talked to Margaret, they are not. But they were reviewing a contract at the time and I don't
know that they write the contract or what, because she didn't get in any real detail about it. And so the timing was kind of good in my communication with her, and that they were really taking a look at the present contract, which was in Oklahoma in Hard Rock.

And when I brought it up, and we were going to try to get other people on the phone but I just said, you know, can we discuss it in the sake of a possibility with Jane Oates, and she said yes, that they had an interest in that and that looking at the date would be important. But she had kind of indicated that they hadn't gotten the correspondence like the Eastern and multi-regional did, as of yet.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: We haven't submitted a request either.

MR. WALDRON: That's true, we haven't submitted a request so, yes.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Okay.

MS. CARROLL: All right, the
conference, the current national conference is scheduled for the last week of October in 2013. A site has already been selected by the conference attendees of our last conference. And generally, we had intended to begin planning in January on that. But since all of this has happened, you know, we're a little leery of entering into a contract first of all, and we're not real sure how to proceed.

We do like the idea of possibly partnering with the 166 national conference. There's something like 97 percent of the grantees include a WIA grant in their plan. That's one of the reasons we partner and have our title workgroup meetings in, you know, conjunction with the regional and national conference, because so many of our grantees are going to be there anyway for that. There are a lot of logistics to work out because also includes education, it includes childcare, it includes TANF, and what's the
other one?

DR. STAPP: Kim, when was your
this year's meeting?

MS. CARROLL: We only have them
every 18 months. So our last one was actually
in March or April in Michigan. I remember it
was very cold and snowy. So those are some
things that we need to, you know, we need to
look at because our grantees will also want to
attend some workshop on how to integrate those
types of programs in with our employment and
training, they're considered related programs,
you know, so all those types of things really
need to be discussed in detail.

MR. WALDRON: What we were going
to do is, based on after our conversation,
hopefully our conversation tomorrow with Jane
Oates, that we would get together and we'd
schedule a meeting right away, telephone
meeting whatever, right away, to begin to talk
a lot more bricks and mortar type discussions
about doing it.
And in fact, you know, looking at maybe late summer or something like that, close to their date, pushing ours out, somewhere in the middle type of deal. So we hadn't officially submitted ours either so, and the conversation was a good one, and may be a solution to a problem.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well I would like to say --

MS. CARROLL: Well, do you think we will get approval?

MR. WALDRON: I don't see why, well, I don't know.

MS. CARROLL: I would have to say too, that 477 has a real interest in seeing that the 166 national conference continues. We have several changes that are going on, we've been working with our federal partners in an administrative flexibility workgroup, teleconferencing weekly.

There have been a lot of changes to our reporting forms, the planning process,
a lot of things that have to do with the administration of our programs. And January would be an excellent, is it in January? No, that's Western. That was the Western.

MR. WALDRON: I thought it was April. The national was going to be in April.

MS. CARROLL: We're going to have to be able to roll this out to the grantees before October, obviously, and it made sense to us that a 166 Conference would be an excellent place to do that. So we have a very vested interest in seeing that that happens.

MR. WALDRON: I think we've got a good chance of getting done with the two of us here, and tomorrow, you know, and then we can do a resolution on it before tomorrow, and present it as part of the package to the Secretary then. You know, discuss the, our unsupport or non-support and present it in that manner, as a recommendation.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Molle?

MS. MOLLE: Yes, I would suggest
that we ask Assistant Secretary tomorrow for
some clarification on specifically some of the
public comments about the conference, you
know, are we mandated to that OMB? And we
really need some clarification today.

MR. WALDRON: That was just Walter
Forrester has asked, I've got to check, but he
asked me to bring up some specific questions
in that meeting.

MS. WHITMAN: Before we leave
today, yes --

MS. MOLLE: We need to know what
they are so we that we can all be together.

MS. WHITMAN: But as we've been
prioritizing the projects, and I'm assuming
that we're going to adjust this to Secretary
Oates, we should perhaps decide who will give
the brief presentation on each item, I mean,
you know, select different ones --

MR. WALDRON: Well we thought we
could kind of do it together, right? I have
some words that Margaret gave me, I was going
to do that --

    MS. CARROLL: Oh, you're talking

about the one issue. I think she's talking

about the whole thing.

    MS. WHITMAN: Well, I'm talking

about the whole thing --

    MR. WALDRON: Oh, I'm sorry.

    MS. WHITMAN: -- I mean, you know,

I don't think it should be just this one

person addressing --

    MR. WALDRON: Well, it should be

the Chair.

    MS. WHITMAN: I think it's nice to

share the responsibility, I mean, of the

projects, because it's a Council project. And

I mean, you know, if anyone has a preference

of what they would like to address.

    MS. CARROLL: Do you want to do It

that way? Do you want to divide it up?

    MS. WHITMAN: Pardon?

    MS. CARROLL: Divide it up to have

--
MS. WHITMAN: Yes, yes, exactly, exactly. Because we've done that before when the Board has given presentations to the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary.

MR. RICHARDSON: Before we do that --

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. Before we do that, what does anyone else think about the importance of legislative advocacy or advocacy for reauthorization? Where does that belong in the scheme of this? Does anyone else thing it has a place up high?

MR. WALDRON: Yes, I see it as a priority. Are we allowed to do it?

MS. CAMPBELL: I have a question.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Educate.

MS. CAMPBELL: Truly. PY 2012 projects, I know we're prioritizing them right now. Looking at all these tasks at hand, if
we get to the first four I think we'll be
doing an excellent job. So we can add them
on, or is that a long term priority,
reauthorization of the Workforce Investment
Act will not occur, especially not within this
next program year.

MS. WHITMAN: That probably will
not occur this year.

MS. CAMPBELL: Not at all.

MS. WHITMAN: No.

MS. CAMPBELL: That I do know.

MR. RICHARDSON: With that said, I
think then it becomes, is it an item that
belongs on this list of priority things? And
then which of these do we prioritize into top
priorities for the next 12 months and which
may be prioritized for the term of the next
three years or five years or something, which
that one may well belong.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. So that would
be short term and long term. But we're
talking about like --
MR. RICHARDSON: Immediately.

MS. CAMPBELL: -- immediate, PY 2012, something that we would give the current Assistant Secretary some heads up on, this is what we're going to be working on, but more importantly, when there's a transition plan put in place, make sure that I capture the top priorities going forward so that new person comes in, they come to meet you, the first meeting we have with them, they're already going to know what your priorities are. That was the purpose.

MR. WALDRON: And we probably can't operate beyond the times of people on this Advisory Board anyway, right?

MS. CAMPBELL: Right, you can't, exactly, good point.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Bernal?

MR. BERNAL: We spoke and worked for a couple of hours on what you call the Outreach task, but I don't see it on the list of 2012 projects. Would that make it a
priority or is that going to be tabled? I recommend it meets the priority list.

MS. WHITMAN: What is your recommendation on that?

MR. BERNAL: That the Outreach task and the roughly two page position paper, called the white paper, some called it a red paper, would be developed by December 31st and presented in January 2013 for the full Council.

MS. CAMPBELL: Because we have a short term deliverable so we did not feel like almost --

MALE PARTICIPANT: Number 1?

MS. CAMPBELL: -- not Number 2, Number 1 we're going to say across the board, we're going to, or what we'll get in terms of priority, I mean if we're going to have a deliverable, a tasked deliverable of December 31st, that's just pretty high priority.

MS. WHITMAN: Number 2 would be the two page?
MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. So we're making a statement that our priorities, to make sure that we stay focused and we deliver 70 percent of the work that we say we're going to, the first one we're going to do is this two page white paper.

MS. WHITMAN: From the Outreach Subgroup.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right. Okay, what we're going to have to do is we're going to have to break because we have one, two, three, four, five, we don't have enough --

MS. WHITMAN: Because we don't have a quorum right now, we will recess for a break.

MS. CAMPBELL: Until 3:30?

MS. WHITMAN: Until 3:30.

(Whereupon, the meeting in the above-mentioned matter went off the record at 3:18 p.m. and went back on the record at 3:41 p.m.)

MS. CAMPBELL: We're going to go
back on record, we do have a quorum, seven.

    MR. WALDRON: Do we count Lorenda in the quorum?

    MS. CAMPBELL: No, she's not, she's participating.

    MR. WALDRON: Take her off mute though, right?

    MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

    DR. STAPP: Okay, can you hear us?

    MS. SANCHEZ: I can hear you now.

    MR. WALDRON: Yes, you've been unmuted.

    MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, so we have, what we did have processed, or was able to have processed, is the memo signed by Jane Oates, that gives us approval to implement the education measure. Now there's the full layout that was proposed, and what she has agreed in terms of the Council initially recommended for the Department to implement the common measures that would require all WIA Section 166 grantees to report on the
education measure.

    Also, and be given the option of
reporting on two of the three other elements
to include average earnings, employment
retention, which are already common measures,
and two other additional newly proposed
measuring would be the credential measure,
which is new, as well as the employment
enhancement measure, all of that's lined out
on Page 2, okay?

    This is pretty much 99.9 percent
of the document that I sent out, went back and
forth with the Council on and asked for
comments, et cetera. Some of the verbage is
different because it went through the lawyer
and I added in what they asked me to add in.

    But in any event, the decision was
made and there's a justification on the third
page, the decision that the Assistant
Secretary made, was that she is in agreement
with Option 1. And what is she agreeing to,
or the Department is agreeing to do, is to
approve a measure that, and one of the two options, meaning that we would all, all WIA Section 166 would report on the interim employment measure, and have the option to choose between three measures, the two existing common measures and the credential only, the credential only.

The Department along in consultation with the Performance Office had determined and has come to the conclusion that the employment enhancement measurement, and we don't have the written justification here, but that it was not included in the option. So if we went forward with the implementation of this education measure, it only includes the credential measure. It does not include the employment enhancement.

MR. WALDRON: I'm good with that. This is good.

MS. CAMPBELL: So as it stands now, and my staff has already been tasked and we've already started the process, right now,
not started the process, Duane started the
process in that I tasked Duane, Guy, and Craig
to begin putting the paperwork together for
OMB clearance.

And so what we're going to do is
we're going to work with the Effective
Management Workgroup, right, to make sure that
we have the correct definition. So what we
have to do now is, is define it so we can
literally measure it, right? So it would be
the numerator and the denominator, make sure
we have that.

And Duane is the guru when it comes and Craig
is the guru. But my job here is to clearly
make sure that the Council knows that's what
that would mean. That's what the Department
is going to implement.

MALE PARTICIPANT: Awesome.

MS. CAMPBELL: Any questions?

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman James?

MS. JAMES: With the credential
measure being to increase the educational
level of the program participants, do you think we can utilize this measure to obtain more funding for our programs? Because as stated before, like the GED testing is going to be electronic. And it's going to be a considerable cost to our programs if we go forth with this measure, it's going to have a lot of demand and we would need funding to support us in this.

So if we need to, I just think that we need to utilize this as a way to getting more funding from Congress to support our programs, to go forth with this.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Waldron?

MR. WALDRON: You know what you can do, because we did it even though we didn't have it yet? We got a GED program. We went and talked to the Department of Ed., excuse me, and the Department of Ed. supported us having a GED because of the statistical level that was coming in on our community.

And then we merged it in with our
WIA program out of the work readiness credential. And we were able to support the two. And that's what guaranteed us our funding. They gave us a little small piece and then they doubled it the next year.

MS. CAMPBELL: Can we work on, because we're going to go forward. If you all don't mind, Craig, can we pull out and start getting an action plan for the implementation of this credential measure? And we have two items on the table. And I hear what you're saying, Jessica, the larger picture is, is that implementing this employment enhancement one, is that we're going to include it in the white paper or at least in some, use it in a way that will benefit us.

And two, Darrell, in terms of how you did it, that's a strategy that would be very helpful for all the community here and perhaps could be a training, or a training offered at the national conference, this is how we did it. This is how we could utilize
that.

So maybe at the really bottom, bottom, or anywhere on that action item, we can make sure that Darrell can do a training, or at least be able to provide the training tools on how that you're GED computerized system and partnering with the state can be used in 166 communities.

Also another comment or recommendation, I guess it would be a task, pretty simple one, I guess as the task, what is that first task that we're going to do, the advocacy? Right, to make sure if we can, to remember to include, and I think that's a very good point, this goal. One, we're implementing a goal, this goal, this employment enhancement, or at least it's for consideration, but just so we don't lose that idea. Is that what you're saying?

MS. JAMES: Yes.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay. That's what I had thought. I know that the, at least my
staff had some communications with Lorenda, I know Duane has been in contact with you and we had a couple of emails.

And for the record, I would like to propose or get an official approval from this Council for the Department of Labor to go forward and to implement this strategy for the community.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Stapp?

DR. STAPP: So I'm okay with going forward with it, based on your explanation. What I would like to see, this paper that we got here, this is Jane's approval here, right?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

DR. STAPP: Just for clarification on this, the way we just talked about it and explained it worked well, where we clearly said, you know, the Option 1, or the other was mandatory and you pick two out of the remaining three. As you read this, that's not what it said.

MS. CAMPBELL: Specifically, yes.
DR. STAPP: Yes, because, and I think it might have been a couple words but now it says approved that Council recommends, community approved what the Council recommends. But it also says and including an additional, yet optional education performance measure as proposed above.

So kind of the way it reads there is that the only thing that's optional is the education part. But then it does say above, referencing back to what we have above, but above also includes an employment enhancer. I know she restated that in the handwritten comment, that you were really vague and not clear on specifics. So is there any way that we can rewrite that to make it clear and have them taken off?

MS. CAMPBELL: Well, we could. First comment is that at Option 1, I literally, verbatimly, took this verbage from what was put forward, it's exactly in here. But nonetheless, I can put it back through.
How long did it take?

MR. LEWIS: Once we get the OMB,

I'm sorry, we're out of the rules of order
now. Once we go through the OMB clearance,
it's going to have to go back through Angie
and Amanda and Jane again for re-signature.

So if we can re-clarify that
language now, if that's where it's going to
get reviewed again and signed off on. And
that's what we need as far as me, Guy, and
Duane, is we need a clear understanding from
the Council on what it should look like.
Because in our discussion, we're on the same
boat as what Angie said, in that it's interim
employment and then two of the three optional,
or, or, or.

DR. STAPP: Right. I think we're
all in agreement.

MR. LEWIS: So if you could
clarify that for us we can put that into our
OMB clearance forms and get that reviewed
again and signed off on, because it does need
to be clarified.

MS. CAMPBELL: So a statement, but specifically we can do it, in the interest of time and trying to get it cleared along, really what we're trying to do as a program is just trying to get this measure cleared so we can start at least collecting information. We have to get approval from OMB.

And our 9084 forms, all of the reporting forms are going to expire next year. So we're trying to do it all together in one package. So that's the bottom line of the urgency with what we're trying to do it all together.

We're also trying to, for example, include in that information collection and get credit for the veterans we're providing services for and their spouses. So that's what we're going to do, we're going to modify the full form and include this definition. But to specifically, to answer your question —
MS. WHITMAN: And also, to include in that, it's not capturing, I mean it's not setting aside, I mean your native Hawaiians or --

MS. CAMPBELL: Right, so native Hawaiians.

MS. WHITMAN: -- although it's in the aggregate forms but, yes, so I mean --

MS. CAMPBELL: Specifically.

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, specifically.

MS. CAMPBELL: So what we can do, because in order to get at specifically what Dr. Stapp is asking for and the Council's asking for, is to present, formally present the definition and what will be collected specifically, defined to the Effective Management Workgroup, right?

That's the, unless we type it up right now and they vote on it, I don't know how else we're going to, because the request is for me to rewrite this and specifically state that, she agreed verbally, I mean I
talked with Jane verbally a lot of times. She understands, that's why she circled and said yes. Part of it is trust. If it is this Council's recommendation that I send a document back through, I'll do that, I'll do that.

I'm not certain that we will get the education measure implemented and through OMB before next Spring, or for the next time we meet. And that's an honest statement.

So we could do this one of two ways. I can reword it so we can specifically state what the Council says and she'll re-approve it when she gets to it or when we can get it throw and re-approved, or we could bring it back to the Effective Management Workgroup after the approval of this Council to go forward with it, because we did get an approval to go forward last time, or at least allow for the Department to go forward with implementing and getting clearance from OMB.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.
202-234-4433
Richardson?

MS. CAMPBELL: Please?

MR. RICHARDSON: Do we just amend this?

MS. RICHARDSON: Can't we just amend this and --

MR. WALDRON: Yes, we've got some take home.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well, you could amend it and --

DR. STAPP: I mean the point is --

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, but how do we capture --

DR. STAPP: The point is, it's vague enough to where there's some wiggle room and we want to do away with the wiggle room and make sure that we have a clear understanding. What you said awhile ago about how you interpreted is agreeable with everybody, you know, having an entering point and then choosing two of the three remaining options. But reading this, it certainly is
not clear you said that. So just for that clarification purpose.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Would we be wise to wait until after tomorrow's discussion with Jane? I walked in, back into the meeting late on, you were in the discussion already, as to what was wrong with the employment enhancement part of the measure. Do we want to hear anything from her or have a discussion with her about her concerns about that part of it? Maybe there's something that she has concern with and that, tomorrow, you know, we could come to some agreement on it and have that part included as well.

And number two, in light of the TAA contracts discussions we held about BearTracks and revisions to Microsoft Office 2010 and the new version coming out, might we want to further revise this language to be
careful about how we refer to BearTracks as BearTracks, and maybe use some other language to reporting software, I mean, more generic language and not specifically BearTracks, and maybe it's a footnote name, BearTracks is currently the software that's in use by the Section 166 grantees. I mean, BearTracks, we could approve this and BearTracks could be gone by July 1 of 2013.

MS. CAMPBELL: What I will say is that I encourage a discussion with the Assistant Secretary tomorrow, especially around a decision about the, not including the, or why she decided not to include the employment enhancement.

DR. STAPP: And if she just sits there and said oh yes, this is why and we say okay, we're already kind of agreeing that we'll take it like it is and not the way it's implied, but the way we just discussed it. Then if she says yes, I agree that's the way the intent is and we just amend it, then she's
giving it her blessing then.

MS. CAMPBELL: She's going to say, she'll look at me and say Angie, rewrite it and send it back through clearance.

DR. STAPP: Okay, so --

MS. CAMPBELL: I guarantee you. That's what's going to happen because this just went --

DR. STAPP: Right, so if you could just rewrite it, so let's rewrite it tonight and when she says Angie, rewrite it, here you go, I've got it rewritten.

MS. CAMPBELL: It doesn't work that way.

MALE PARTICIPANT: It's got to go through clearance process.

MS. CAMPBELL: It does not work that way. If it worked that way I'd say we could do it. But it doesn't work that way.

DR. STAPP: Well maybe it went through the OMB.

MS. CAMPBELL: Excuse me?
DR. STAPP: I said maybe they'll correct it in OMB.

MS. CAMPBELL: No, no.

MS. WHITMAN: They don't understand what we're trying to do.

MS. CAMPBELL: What we can do is one, is have the discussion with Jane tomorrow. She's going to turn to me and say, Angie, can you recall the conversation that we had? And we can layout exactly what she had said, Amanda's going to be there, too, because I remember what she had specifically told us to do. She will say yes, that's what I'm agreeing to.

She'll also give further information as to why we're not including the other employment enhancement, she didn't provide me a justification why or why not. She said I'm not including that one. I do believe that the credential measure is why she is in agreement because it is consistent with what is being implemented on the state side.
MR. WALDRON: It's already implemented.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right. And they do want to maintain the common measures. And this way, we're doing both. So with that, we could put this off to further discussion tomorrow.

In terms of an action plan from my office, and at that time, after talking with the Assistant Secretary, this Council can decide whether or not, because we really need to know right now, this is a priority for my office, to get this implemented. If it's the decision of the Council not to implement it, we'll put it off until after, probably well after February 2013.

But the disadvantage of that is that I know that I at least spent the last four years with this Council trying to put this measure in place. We have the approval of this Administration, and if we don't strike when the iron's hot, we're going to push the
information collection clearance under this Administration, specifically with James Hardin, who's a, what's James's last name, from OMB, who worked with us?

MS. WHITMAN: Hardin.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, James Hardin, a colleague of mine I met, OMB clearance, worked with him on 477, who's willing to help me to get this through. So we'll have this discussion tomorrow, you all will advise me on what we're going to do and then what I should do, and we'll go from there.

MR. RICHARDSON: Let's just get it done because we may not have the same Administration. And that would be, then we'll be back to square one.

MS. CARROLL: Just for clarification, what this will do then is provide the provincial measure but not the employment enhancement measure.

MS. CAMPBELL: Correct.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. I do agree
that we need to go ahead and do that.

However, I have a problem with that, the whole ideal was that we needed the employment enhancement measure. And if you look at the first sentence at the top of the same page, it is estimated that approximately 85 percent of WIA Section 166 customers served did not have the skills to obtain a high school diploma, a general education development, or vocational skills certification. And that's the only thing that's being measured. So we're leaving out 85 percent of our caseload.

MS. CAMPBELL: And that's why we're going to have the conversation with the Assistant Secretary. And as a Council we provide her advisement. What I'm saying is this is the decision she made, the Department had made, at this point, without further discussions, willing to implement. But we could discuss --

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Waldron?

MS. CAMPBELL: -- further, she
might change it, I don't know.

MR. WALDRON: I think we already have an employment enhancement in the program already, there's a section in there in the regs, and maybe Bob, because he probably knows the regs better than I do, but there's a section in the regs that talks about employment enhancement, primarily labels a eligible client who is working already, and is about to lose their employment, or those in opportunity for advancement, they don't have the credentials and they may lose their employment, that under enhancement, you can infuse more dollars for education and training, so it's somewhat in there already.

Now and that could pertain to a GED. They could have a position that needs a GED level to continue. So that one we've been using flexible over the years. But the education piece itself here is good. It would be nice to get them both but --

MS. CARROLL: I thought one of the
things that we were really concerned with being able to capture was the work that we did with individuals before they ever got to that stage. And that's what's identified in number four, or number three.

MS. CAMPBELL: But I'm thinking, and just having the conversation, which she did give us written feedback, and they do, it doesn't happen that way, but nonetheless, I do recall the conversation and it's really being able to truly define and measure, you know, the flexibility, or defining what would, and I think this is the conversation you had with her, what would, how would employment enhancement like really be defined, you know, specifically. And not have, you know, all of the different, you know, possible variables in the definition. I don't know.

But I encourage tomorrow, tomorrow, we'll have this conversation with Jane, we'll put it at the top. And I think it's on those bullet points, right, that you
sent over?

MR. LEWIS: With the education minutes?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes. It's not on there?

MS. CARROLL: It's not there, no.

MS. CAMPBELL: Was it a priority?

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Yes, it is, it's point three.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, okay. Mike, do me a favor?

MR. WALDRON: Full, we got full implementation so that's good.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, could you highlight number three, email --

MR. DELANEY: Email it back to her without number three?

MS. CAMPBELL: No, no, just take number three, email Dawn, cc Amanda, for the educational employment measure, and let them know there will be a full discussion on the Council recommendations regarding employment.
enhancement, and email that, so she'll know.

MS. RICHARDSON: Angie, also, when I was looking over the transmission paper that we had done for this Administration, I saw in there that we had agreed that the support for the Council would not come out of the one percent, TAT money. And that has not been really addressed. Everything else on there seems to have been addressed.

MS. CAMPBELL: That's outside of this education enhancement, you know, I really wanted to, did we come to a final decision on this, and we're not going to create any kind of action plan or deliverables, from my office at least, it will all be dependent on tomorrow morning, and after the special, right?

MR. LEWIS: Can I add something, Madam Chair?

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, please.

MR. LEWIS: I mean, just as a clarification on what Darrell just said about the enhancement, you're mixing two things,
that's eligibility. And we're talking a
measure, okay.

Retraining as the grantee sees

fit, they can bring somebody off to retain a
job or to get a promotion. That's for

eligibility, that's right in there with

unemployed, underemployed, low income, to get

them on the program. But a measure is when

they've already exited and when they attain

for that person. So it's two different areas.

MR. WALDRON: But you can service

flexibility in there.

MR. LEWIS: Yes.

MR. WALDRON: Although it's kind

of there already. So that's the actual

measure.

MR. LEWIS: The actual measure of

it is that first one, that interim employment,

because you would enhance them to get

employed.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, I think the

key this is that, what I think Jane will come
back and ask is okay, how would you propose to define this and how are you going to measure it? That's exactly what I know she'll come back and have the dialogue there. And then from there, she'll task, you know, my office and that's what we'll do is resubmit the entire proposal back to her for reconsideration.

MS. WHITMAN: So this does not explain enough on Page 2, that --

MS. CAMPBELL: You would have to ask her tomorrow.

MR. WALDRON: She didn't like it.

MS. CAMPBELL: Ask her tomorrow.

But for the record, and I want for the Council to know that this will require, it will require and we will resubmit it for a decision, which will probably, will not be made signed off and made before the new Administration comes into play.

So as long as we're all on the same page, please know that, that it's not
that my office is not going to do it. Once we
go back through the process and it's resigned
and it goes back through the performance
office and the lawyer's office, it probably
will not, it probably won't be resigned until
the new Administration comes in. So we're
looking at January, February of 2013 before we
come back and ask you all about this again.

MS. CARROLL: Well I don't think
that we want to hold up an education measure.
But I think that if this one goes ahead and
goes through as described, that the Advisory
Council is going to begin once again, to try
to get another measure because the whole
discussion was on being able to get credit for
all of the work that we do with individuals
before they're ever ready to try for a GED or
a high school diploma, or even a technical or
occupational certification.

MS. CAMPBELL: And I respect that
decision, but I'm talking about just in terms
of the process, just so we're --
MS. CARROLL: I'm thinking that's going to be separate, that's going to be a new initiative. I don't think we want to hold up this.

MR. WALDRON: So we get what we got and then we add another one on another time.

MS. CAMPBELL: I explained to you all the process. Because also, not only that, we have two weeks, two weeks for the election. I'm not certain Jane signed off on this education measure. Secretary Solis agrees to this implementation of, this current Administration supports this initiative and this Council.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: And I think we should embrace that.

MS. CAMPBELL: And we can have the dialogue and we can always put forward another proposal to a new Administration, add additional one. And I don't know what they're going to say.
All I can say is this

Administration said yes, Indian and Native American Program, you can implement this idea, or we could put, we could re-word, I could send an email, we can have it written up for tomorrow for concurrence, but my concern is that when it will go back to clearance, it will not meet the November 6th, right, is the election, right?

And right now, just like the conference memo, just like a lot of documents, after a certain period, the federal government, or at least when there's change in Administration, no decisions are made until a formal new Administration is appointed. So that's, I just want to be honest and let you know that.

DR. STAPP: Well we get that, but I think all we're asking is that it's great because she signed off and we just want it to be accurate going forward because we're hashing around what we think she said or is
thinking, but what if she's not? You know, she signed off on and again, this is not clear, no one had a good, clear understanding of this page when we came in here today. Now you clarified it for us and we agree with that, but if it has to only be in there everybody else, is everybody else thinking like us? 

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: I mean, if we were to say yes, we accept her approved version of it, rewrite it, and send it forward, if we said that right now, what difference is saying that tomorrow at this time going to make?

MS. CAMPBELL: There's no difference.

MR. RICHARDSON: No difference, so --

MS. CAMPBELL: Well, I mean, in terms of the process it makes no difference.
But again, for the record, once we make the recommendation we want the written changes, we're --

DR. STAPP: We're not wanting changes, just we want clarification. I think what he's getting at is let's get it from her and saying well, this is what I meant by saying that.

MR. RICHARDSON: That's right.

And the grantees and the Effective Management Workgroup, in hashing out all the definition of the enhancement or employability skill enhancement, I remember discussions about some grantee reservation communities or off-reservation communities, that have people that have lived in such poverty and low educational attainment levels that one of the greatest accomplishments you'll have with them is getting them reading at a 10th grade level. They can get a job from that.

And yes, they'll need employment, interim employment rate from that, but there
should be some credit that grantees who do the hard work of getting Indian people to that next level. And that's what this measure attempts to do.

Maybe having her in discussion about that may give her a different understanding. She may say okay. I mean, I think you're saying no, she's not going to, but --

MS. CAMPBELL: I think it's important to have the conversation with her tomorrow, but I think that it would be unfair of me, as I work with Jane, this is her decision. And she will have a dialogue with us.

I think it's a very good idea to capture specifically, she's going to turn to me and say Angie, what did we agree to do? And I'll state the same thing I just stated. And for the record, we would have that, if that's what we're asking for.

And then we'll have the, you all
with have a further dialogue with her and I will go down, probably back in for tomorrow morning about your concerns about not implementing the sustainability, whatever. I'll just get further clarification why the Department didn't choose the employment enhancement credential, that's not included as an option.

MR. RICHARDSON: Because that was the only one, right, just that part?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. RICHARDSON: I mean I think, sounds like in my perspective, I'm happy, you know, that the Department is agreeing, you know, to allow us credential measurement, sure. But she's coming tomorrow anyway so, you know, it gives you a window of that discussion.

MR. WALDRON: I'm excited we got this far, eight years.

MS. CAMPBELL: But I'm concerned, eight years?
MR. WALDRON: Eight years, that's how long it's been, the former Bush Administration and four years, eight years.

MS. CAMPBELL: And four of which, we participated in this. So we'll see what she says tomorrow.

MS. WHITMAN: We have 15 minutes left to our meeting. Do we want to, at this point, at least, decide who will give a brief report on each of the areas, do the Council members have a preference on what they would like to present to the Secretary?

MR. WALDRON: What time is she here in the morning?

MS. WHITMAN: It will be at 10:45.

MS. CAMPBELL: I put 10:45. She has a briefing on the Hill in the morning and then she'll be in as soon as she gets back to the office. She said 10:30 but I gave her until 10:45 to make sure, and then she'll be in until we adjourn.

MR. WALDRON: And we adjourn at
12:00?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, we'll adjourn at 12:00.

MS. WHITMAN: Yes, because we still have, I mean, we still have then on the agenda from 9:30 to 10:30 to address again the education measure, the TAT contract, and the DOL conference request process. And that's all before our --

MS. CAMPBELL: She comes on board.

MS. WHITMAN: Yes.

MR. WALDRON: Can I ask a quick, so what are we going to discuss on the T&TA, the systems contract, because it's kind of done --

MS. CAMPBELL: Well, I just wanted to make sure there was time for this meeting, for you all to ask, for the Council to ask me questions, or if there were some, you know, additional tasks or something, any additional questions, that was the time to do that. You know, we could finish with the education
measure, maybe prepare some questions, specific questions for the Assistant Secretary.

MS. WHITMAN: Some of the questions, well, some of the questions were addressed in the public comments that knowing from hearing some, you know, various grantee, you know, what was the document that was used to make this decision? I mean, because from all indications of looking at Executive Order, et cetera, it referred to several employees.

MR. WALDRON: And you're talking the conference document.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right.

MS. WHITMAN: Yes.

MR. WALDRON: That's on after last one.

MS. CAMPBELL: The directive, the Executive Order, because it came from GAO, that Executive Order, I mean get the number, that's public information. So the Executive Order was issued to the Department, Secretary
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Solis. Secretary Solis specifically, Deputy Secretary Harris, they issued a memo.

A Secretary can take a memo and, or the guidance or an Executive Order, and what the Executive Order says that they are to implement a policy. And that's the guidance that was provided to the Assistant Secretaries. And Assistant Secretary Oates, and this is going to be a good question that you can ask because it was her decision, to include grantees. That was a Department's decision.

We don't have, I don't have, if she wants to share, if she gives me the right to share a memo that was issued to her, to your community, I have the copy standing by on my desk. But that order was given to her as the Assistant Secretary. She didn't give a memo to me as a Program Manager, not even the Administrator, to share with me as a Chief. And so that, I mean that's the pecking order of the --
MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: And I think that's the point I was trying to get to earlier before we started public comment. That's what has me confused. Because it would seem to me that any directive of that sort would deal with Department of Labor funds, personnel, that sort of thing.

However, the TA money was grantee money. It was allocated to grantees. Grantees determined that they wanted to use it for technical assistance and that technical assistance was going to be conducted via conferences, in addition to other things, but through the national conference as well as the regional conferences. I don't understand how that memorandum or that Executive, or any of that, applied to those funds.

MS. CAMPBELL: That's a great question to ask Jane, because she will be able to provide in terms of the guidance, and I do
have, and tomorrow when she says Angie, you
can release it, I'd be more than happy to, be
more than happy to. Half of what I do is I
take orders very seriously, especially because
I'm military, you give me an order, I'm going
to follow the order.

And there's even specific in terms
of what goes in through the memo to even
request it. There's a lot of information, I
think it would be very beneficial as a
Division Chief for the Indian and Native
American Program, I've asked. I've asked the
Administrator and I've asked the Deputy
Assistant Secretary if and when this type of
guidance will come out. Because we're just
saying it's very important, very, very
important.

So a request has been made, but
that's a good question to propose tomorrow,
especially the request to have the information
made public. And if she wants to, she gives
me the authority to share the memo, we have
them copied, Mike, ready to go upstairs, right?

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. WHITMAN: Oh yes, and as I had indicated earlier this afternoon, I don't know, it was between public comments. I, you know, the example I gave is that recently, and this was last week, in the state of Hawaii, the state WIA program had a conference and invited partners, which included us. And so it was a three day conference which included travel from the neighbor islands and people coming from the mainland. So I would like to know what the difference is with that.

MS. CARROLL: Do you have any idea what the cost per participant was for that conference?

MS. WHITMAN: I have no idea. I didn't see the cost. We were invited to participate.

MR. WALDRON: That could have been approved prior to the order, too.
MS. CAMPBELL: Exactly. And it could have been approved before February 14th, because that's when the memo came down. So, and I don't know, I don't know. But I do know that we submitted our paperwork and I do, we can share what was submitted by the, that I can and I have the copies. I didn't know whether or not you want it.

The breakdown for the cost per participant that we received from the Midwest and Western conference members, specifically Lois, Joe Quetone, and Jeff Foster, I mean I literally did this.

And I started the process with the national and I've also started the process with the Midwestern folks. For example, Darrell, cost per participant right now for the national conference average would be what? Just --

MR. WALDRON: I have it in the book.

MS. CAMPBELL: Approximately.
MR. WALDRON: I think it was $1,000.

MS. CAMPBELL: Per, that's for travel.

MR. WALDRON: That's everything.

MS. WHITMAN: That's everything.

MR. WALDRON: That included per diem and all of that.

MS. CAMPBELL: Per diem.

MR. WALDRON: Yes, everything. Travel I think we were a little low, we were around $700. But we kind of tweaked it, listening to the conversations we kind of tweaked our numbers a little bit, but we were under $500,000.

MS. CAMPBELL: Under $500,000.

They came in at $200,000.

MR. WALDRON: They came in at $202,000, we're at $438,000 right now.

MS. CAMPBELL: $202,000, and that's the $202,000 with the hotel. They projected to have 150 participants initially.
attend, 150 participants. It would be hotel, per diem at $93, with 14 percent tax. That's for the hotel. The per diem for that rate, for that area, and I wrote this a thousand times, is $73, right?

And they literally take this and put it in an Excel spreadsheet. So when I'm talking about an estimate, we literally give, and it's time, so we take the cost for the hotel, the cost for the per diem. We went lowball and went to what, $600 to travel on the airplane, we broke it down by car, how many we projected would go by car, literally, and what it would cost round trip, and times 150, came up to $202,000. And that didn't even include the presenters, or DINAP travel, which is separate. But they assess the whole cost of the conference.

But please, I really encourage, this is the time to ask her. But more importantly, what is the strategy under the TAT going forward? And how do we prevent it,
this from happening for the national conference, or for the Western conference? Because irregardless of what the Department decides or how they decide it and what's the paperwork, and all of that stuff, despite all of that, we still have to, per OMB, go through the request. My office will still have to go through the request for the national conference or the Western conference.

MR. WALDRON: And the numbers vary a little bit but, you know, you kind of get to know lowball aspect and look at it, that here's what it is.

MS. CAMPBELL: And I lowballed it.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: We did, we reduced that quite a bit. We didn't plug in private money, which was a, you know, was a negotiating technique. We can apply in private money of $50,000, $100,000, you know, and back that number down and everything. The
real key issue is the grantee allowable issue, it's light and their money --

MS. CAMPBELL: It's cost.

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. WHITMAN: Well, it just involved mileage. I mean, I would hope to goodness that that wouldn't be, I mean, okay, but my staff who came in from the different islands.

MALE PARTICIPANT: And was there registration fees and everything?

MS. WHITMAN: No, no, the state had comp'd that for us.

MS. CAMPBELL: That's a good question. And also too, another question I know she's anticipating is because the, a question regarding a request for a waiver for us all together, so we wouldn't have to go through the process, was also put in to the Solicitor's Office, specifically the use of the casinos. She has tasked her Deputy to get a legal interpretation of why that is not
allowable.

But we are looking forward, and I was, one strategy is to request, we can't even request a waiver because it's not a statute, but at least it may be excused from this exercise, maybe under the premise that it isn't a TAT agreement. What I know is that this process came down. And actually all of our conferences got caught up in the process.

I pulled out two of the conferences and put forward the Western conference first, and that was not back in June, it was actually back in May we started, Mike, May? We've had teleconferences all along. So I think this is a good, if anything, this is a really good discussion for tomorrow, along with the education measure for the Secretary.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Richardson?

MR. RICHARDSON: Just for clarity, the Western conference has not been cancelled
by Labor, because they --

MS. CAMPBELL: And they haven't
scheduled, and a formal request hasn't come
forth.

MS. WHITMAN: Has not been
submitted.

MR. RICHARDSON: Because I had
gotten an email from one of the grantees that
said it has been cancelled, the same action
from Labor, at the Western conference.

MS. CAMPBELL: It appeared, and
Amanda finalized, well here's the paperwork
right here, yes, it was included in the, and
that was the, see, it was, I think it was
included across the board, in that the request
went forward and the denial letter did come
from the Administrator of Office of Workforce
Investment. So Amanda did the final
generation and she signed off on that letter.

MS. WHITMAN: But how did the
Western one get included when the formal
request was not even submitted?
MS. CAMPBELL: Amanda will be at the meeting tomorrow.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Richardson, did you have something?

MS. CAMPBELL: We can share this one, please do.

MS. RICHARDSON: I mean, I was asking about cost because we were asking about cost per participant for conferences. And I was just thinking, is that the basis for denying conference, was it based on cost per participant?

MR. WALDRON: Yes, that's what the letter said. But you know, with the native casinos it can actually be cheaper. I mean our rate was great in Michigan, but it was cheaper than what they were getting up there in Memphis. I mean, sometimes with the tribal owned business, you can cut a good deal, a better deal than we would normally.

MS. WHITMAN: Councilwoman Molle?

MS. MOLLE: I had the same
question. Was that the reasoning, because it was $2,000 and above or it needed to be below $2,000? What was that dollar amount?

MS. CAMPBELL: That's a good question to ask the Assistant Secretary.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: So there was no basis, she just didn't approve it.

MS. RICHARDSON: We're trying to understand what took place.

MS. WHITMAN: We have a few minutes.

MS. CAMPBELL: What, I can tell you what took place, I'm sorry?

MS. WHITMAN: Councilman Bernal?

MR. BERNAL: The letter that I received, the memo --

MS. WHITMAN: Oh, you have copied.

MR. BERNAL: And this is highlighted through the email to, Inspector Campbell was, the first paragraph states that the request came from our Western Region, of training conferences. The third paragraph
states after careful review, the request for
the Midwest and Western was denied.

And the fourth paragraph states
that, it acknowledges the disapproval of the
conference as far as just the cost for the
Midwest and Eastern. So they're going back
and forth between Western, Midwest, and
Eastern I think, I'm not sure. It appears to
me that the areas are mixed up. Because it
starts with the request for the Midwest and it
says denied for the West and the Midwest and
understands the implications that will result
in hardship for the Midwestern and Eastern.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right. And --

MR. BERNAL: If that makes sense.

MS. CAMPBELL: -- I'm ultimately
going to be responsible for this one, so I'm
going to answer it. The initial waiver
request went in for all of, the entire
package, all three conferences went in at the
same time under the premise that we're talking
about grantee moneys. And this is before the
February 17th memo. And this whole package went forward. It went under the premise when we were asking for a blanket waiver of all of the conferences, okay?

And as the package went forward, it's still going forward, they just haven't made any decision on what's going to happen. The Midwest and Western conference came up and I had a teleconference with Darrell, you were on, you were on back in, right, Lorenda was on the line, there was one specifically with the national conferences and there's some email information that we had.

And at that time they decided, that was stated in the public comment, that they were going to go forward with this conference. And so, this is not pure justification for the mix-up, but I know that for Amanda, perhaps, there is the combining or the crossing over of the Midwest and the Western, no matter what formally went through. She's looking at the Midwestern because to
Amanda who is the Administrator, she is the acting Administrator, I'm not making excuses for her because she's going to look for me and say well Angie, this is wrong. But in any event, that's the only explanation that I can think of why she says, that why it stated the Western regional conference and the intertwining of the Midwest regional conference. I mean that's --

MR. WALDRON: And we'll find out tomorrow.

MS. CAMPBELL: We'll find out tomorrow.

MS. WHITMAN: So since we didn't decide who --

MS. CAMPBELL: Here's some of the numbers you guys can take a look at.

MS. WHITMAN: -- who might be presenting tomorrow, we can do it tomorrow because then everyone has a chance this evening to ponder over it and --

MR. WALDRON: You need a gavel.
MS. WHITMAN: Pardon?

MR. WALDRON: You need a gavel.

MS. WHITMAN: I'll bring a drum.

MS. CAMPBELL: Also too, just one main thing is that Assistant Secretary Oates, she is a solution-focused type of individual. So when we go to her, we could have an idea of what we, we could ask her the question, she's going to come back and of course ask, of the Council, well how are you going to do this, before she'll make any promises or decisions.

And two, she may not make a decision because it is within two weeks, right, of her possible end of the tenure at the Department of Labor. So, going into this meeting tomorrow, I mean that's what we'll experience.

So if you're going to come forward and ask for, it's one thing to have a dialogue with her about the education measure. It's another thing to have a dialogue regarding the conference approval process.
Behind those dialogues, you know, a clear request should be put forward clearly, yes or no, can this happen, and this is why it should happen. Can we go forward, if we put forward, like for example, an approval or waiver, would the Department consider it? Something very concrete, not to go in and process because we're going and process she'll say, she's going to listen but she's not going to really give a response unless you have a plan.

And whatever you ask for and if she's agreeable, she's going to look at me and say Angie, put it in place. And I have not problem putting it in place, but that's how she operates.

MR. WALDRON: If we get a formal resolution from this Council, is that to her an understanding of 477 conference? If you said it to her as the informal, Council doesn't help? She won't feel painted in the corner.
MS. CAMPBELL: Just remember, you're not going to paint her in the corner. We provide advisement to the Department, to ask of her, she already put forward the request. We advised the Department that maybe, perhaps, and if you're going to put in a resolution that should like go to the Department. But if we ask her, this is what we want, this is what, and then we'll follow through with the work, that's different.

MR. WALDRON: Yes. Just don't want to hear an angry answer in her own way.

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, because we're not a tribe also so we don't, you know, we don't put, I mean, resolution is something totally different. So do we put together a --

MALE PARTICIPANT: Or confidence broke.

MS. WHITMAN: A recommendation.

MS. CAMPBELL: -- recommendations, this is what we recommend, this is what we would like your agreement on, for example the
education. And maybe we can work on that first thing in the morning because we're five minutes over.

MR. WALDRON: Right.

MS. WHITMAN: All right. Okay, it's 4:35, and is there a motion to recess until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow? Mr. Waldron has made the motion, seconded by --

MS. CAMPBELL: No, we are at the Department of Labor.

MS. WHITMAN: Oh, right, exactly. We will reconvene at the Department of Labor at 9:00 tomorrow.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 4:35 p.m.)
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