CENTER,

least any role where she would realize "economic benefit."

The appeals court ultimately dodged the issue, deciding instead that "the circuit court was without jurisdiction to determine whether Parento violated the EBCE." (p.30)

The appeals court declined to rule on whether Parento violated the ethics code because other "administrative remedies" weren't exhausted prior to the case being presented to Franklin Circuit Court. According to the decision, "if the EBCE is violated in relation to a contract with the Commonwealth, the secretary of the FAC may void the contract." (p. 30-31)

The Appeals Court said the litigant raising the question - Anthem - should have pursued an ethics complaint through the Ethics Commission before bringing litigation. It wrote, "it is a settled rule that a party is required to exhaust administrative remedies as a jurisdictional prerequisite to seeking judicial relief[.] This allows the administrative body the opportunity to first build a factual record and render a final decision." (p. 31)

This part of the decision — with citations to prior cases — ignores the fact that investigations by the Ethics Commission can take years to complete. The appeals court is basically saying

Name:

Address:

—Continued from page four

Anthem should have taken the matter to the Commission, waited patiently for however long that process took to be resolved and then - if the Ethics Commission found Parento violated the EBCE - filed their lawsuit.

During that time,
Anthem's customers
would have been forced
to choose another
MCO. Given the certain
loss of their members
(and the nearly impossible task of getting
them back if they prevailed) it's understandable why Anthem might
have believed a more
immediate judicial
remedy was their best
option.

Nothing in the decision exonerates Parento's role as a Molina consultant. As noted above, the appeals court didn't consider whether Parento violated the EBCE. The decision made clear she bound herself to the ECBE through the confidentiality agreement she signed. Piecing parts of the decision together suggests her role with Molina might have crossed the lines drawn by the EBCE.

After the contracts were cancelled, she was retained by Molina and highlighted as part of their team in response to the reissued RFP. Assuming she's been compensated for her work, hasn't Parento realized an "economic benefit" on a matter she was involved with?

In August 2020,

we revealed Parento's services were retained by Molina only after Beshear was elected. In a July 2020 post we wrote:

If Parento's expertise created real value for Molina to position itself favorably to win the state's business wouldn't they have engaged her services for the first bid?

Or was she brought on - and highlighted in their proposal - more for her connections to a new administration than whatever value she will contribute to the delivery of Medicaid services to Kentuckians?

We wrapped up the July 2020 post with "taxpayers have witnessed so much of the latter in Frankfort that these questions must be asked." We continue to stand by that statement.

*** *** ***

Billions of dollars, and more importantly, how hundreds of thousands of Kentuckians get their health care are at stake in this lawsuit, which should be getting more coverage by the Frankfort media. Transparency is critical to the proper and ethical functioning of government. Yet while Parento's role in this controversy is featured in close to one-third of the pages of the appeals court decision, it merits only a single sentence in Yetter's article.

Grow Your Business With Us!

Call 270-866-3191 Today to place your business advertisement in the Times Journal

ORDINANCE NO: 2022-004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NUMBER 2017-07, WATER USER TAP FEES.

WHEREAS, The City of Jamestown, Kentucky has constructed a water production/treatment/distribution system; and

WHEREAS, it is the City's intent to establish proportionate user charges, that place the costs of supply upon users inside and outside of the city limits of Jamestown, provide potable water and maintain

WHEREAS, the city must pay the OM&R, distribution and debt services expenses associated with the said system accordingly;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE Council of the City of Jamestown, Kentucky, that the following connection fees are established:

WATER TAPS

Regular¾ inch tap One Inch tap or bigger Actual cost of tap
Actual cost of tap

Inside City / Outside City

This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after October 1st, 2022 as provided by law.

No other provisions of Ordinance Number 2017-07 (passed January 18, 2018) are affected by the passage of this Ordinance.

First Reading August 18th 2022

Second Reading September 15th 2022

Publication September 22rd 2022



Tyler McGowan, City Clerk/Treasurer



(270) 866-3191

Phone: ______Phone: