

# MEETING MINUTES

August 15, 2012

## GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE FOR THE PURCHASE OF COMMODITIES AND SERVICES FROM THE HANDICAPPED

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Cedric Greene at 10:00 a.m. August 15, 2012 at the new office located at 400 Allen Drive, Charleston, West Virginia.

### ATTENDANCE:

Committee: Cedric Greene, (Chairperson); William "Bill" Monterosso, Executive Director; Everette Sullivan; Brenda Bates; Jan Smith; Phillip Mason; Mike Sheets, Executive Secretary; Carol Jarrett, Recording Secretary.

WVARF Staff: William "Bill" Monterosso, Sherrie Briggs, Leona Hoffmann

Absent: Phillip Mason, Mike Sheets  
Jan Smith attended by conference call

Guests: Horace Emery, Suttle & Stalnaker  
Melinda Tucker, Suttle & Stalnaker  
Cheri Bever, Goodwill President/CEO  
Elizabeth Sampson, Clay County Services Unlimited  
and Executive Committee for WVARF  
Debbie Birthisel, Green Acres Regional Center  
Kim Nuckles, ADA Coordinator for State of WV

### COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT:

Mr. Greene, let's have a roll call and everyone introduce yourselves.

Ms. Greene, Bill and I will have a meeting every Monday before our regular meeting. We met this Monday for about an hour so we could get to know each other a little better and so the Committee can get what the Committee needs.

Mr. Greene, has everyone had an opportunity to look at the minutes from our last meeting?

### **MOTION #1**

**Mr. Sullivan, I move the minutes be approved. Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.**

Mr. Greene, we are skipping around today as we have a guest with us to speak about the financial report.

Mr. Monterosso, at the last meeting there was a discussion of financials and the ability for the Committee to interpret. We were in the process of shifting from Peachtree to Quick Books software. We will be able to do more with the new system and more closely manage the finances. I will turn this over to Mr. Horace Emery with Suttle and Stalnaker at this time.

Mr. Emery, the main disclaimer being, we didn't have anything to do with putting together the 2013 budget. We have a document that Marsha dropped off to us. I can talk about what I see in the document. I don't believe we were ever involved in the budget preparation process. We worked pretty intensively for several months to help get things caught up. Melinda has been coming down for about a day or a half day each month. There were some bookkeeping issues and things were behind over the last six months or longer. Things seemed to have been going rather smoothly over the last six months. Our involvement has decreased quite a bit overtime.

Revenue wise and the budget that she prepared for 2013 really looks like she added on a nominal kind of increase and she didn't leave me any notes and I don't know if that was anticipated more services or maybe charge a little bit more, not sure if there was a rate factor in there. The 2012 budget went from \$13,240,000 to \$13,400,000. It was \$160,000 increase which is on the revenue side. The others are pretty close on the revenue side. On the expense side, the salaries she had budgeted \$105,000 on the expense side more than the prior year and said that was additional clerical staff and increased salary for the Executive Director. Other expenses for anticipated allowance for bonuses, overtime, etc. Some increases in benefits related to those increases. Add all the benefits related to that it is added up to \$23,000 decrease which is the estimated search for a new Executive Director in 2012 and she took that out for 2013 budget wise.

Mr. Monterosso, that invoice came to \$24,000, as we just paid that invoice.

Mr. Greene, so we spent \$24,000 for what?

Ms. Bates, it was for the search committee to find a Director.

Ms. Smith, I have statement of financial but not that. Nothing was sent to me but the budget.

Mr. Sullivan, I didn't get anything either.

Ms. Bates, I had a copy of it, it was with the agenda, I got a copy of it and it was emailed.

Ms. Smith, I have a statement of financials and statement of activity.

Mr. Greene, no one got a copy of that. No one got a copy of what the CPA has.

Mr. Greene, we did pay \$24,000 for the search committee for the Executive Director.

Mr. Emery, this particular budget doesn't have a total of the increases or decreases for expenses. Budget for 2012 was \$13,122,000 and expenses in the budget for 2013 are \$14,219,000. It is actually \$1,200,000 increase in the budget. Second disclaimer is that Melinda was on vacation last week and she is in the middle of moving from where she had been sitting as we have been doing some remodeling at our place. She found this budget late last night in one of her boxes. I told you there was \$160,000 increase in revenue. That actual increase in revenue really is the increase over the estimated final 2012 that she had, not the 2012 budget. Looks like that is what the column says, but that is not actually what it was. The actual increase over budget looks like a little over 1M. Increase in what she was estimating when she prepared the budget was about \$160,000. Increase in expenses compared to what she was estimating final 2012 to the budget was \$165,000 - \$170,000. Revenues will equal expenses. For the year you did have a positive increase for 2012 of \$110,000.

Ms. Bates, was the \$110,000 rolled over to the 2013 budget?

Mr. Emery, no, the budget was not prepared that way.

Ms. Bates, the \$110,000 has to show in the budget for 2013, it can't be put somewhere else. That is a major issue the Committee has is making sure what happens to that \$110,000 overage. It has to be built in to the 2013 budget and has to have specific earmarked expenses for that \$110,000 that was in overage. So, Bill if they haven't done that, they will need to be doing that.

Mr. Greene, Bill have you seen this thing that Marsha dropped off?

Mr. Monterosso, it is the same thing that we looked at when we met at the Governor's Committee. There are no notes so I am trying to talk to various people how this budget was actually built.

Brenda, it should show what happened to the 2012 additional revenue.

Ms. Emery, what about cumulative prior years?

Ms. Bates, last year there was an overage, Greg Raber, the former Executive Director, came up with a plan for use of that money, training, etc., and we never really got a report on that. It is not normal. The total 4.1% has to be spent for State Use activities. The issue comes up at the end of every year, if there is an overage, what happens to that? Last year we had Greg come up with a plan as to how he was going to spend that money. There should have been a report at the end of the budget year, this was the overage for last year and this is how it was spent. What the Committee has to look at, is 4.1% too much to operate the state use budget. If it is too much then the Committee has to lower the percentage. That is the rule. I am the one that always brings this up. Nobody likes it but that is just the rule.

Ms. Smith, that was very well stated Brenda. We do have to be concerned about that because this program is open for other people to be looking at it and deciding what we need to be doing with the money and I agree we need the report and we need a plan for this year also.

Ms. Bates, so I guess that would be the mission to Bill to work with your CPA firm or whatever.

Mr. Emery, we are not involved in this but we are more than happy to work with you on that.

Ms. Bates, we have got to know what happened to last year's overage and the plan for this year's overage and to be sure it gets back into the State Use program. It has to get back into the State Use program somehow.

Mr. Sullivan, I think it was about \$40,000 last year.

Ms. Bates, it wasn't as much as this year and I think they came up with a plan for training but I'm not sure if it was followed through with.

Mr. Emery, internal financial statements haven't been audited at this point. Aged receivables of \$160,000 that was over 120 days. Whether or not some of that is not collectable would impact those results. That is the only thing that would come into play and significantly affect it.

Ms. Bates, the aged receivables should come in because it is all state government, we control that. There shouldn't be any aged receivables that WVARF cannot collect. If there is, Cedric needs to know about it and we can certainly get that taken care of as a Committee.

Mr. Emery, there is a big one; it is Sharpe Hospital for \$100,000. IS&C has about \$15,000 or so. We say uncollectable, but there may be some type of disagreements too, I have no idea. Needs to be followed up on.

Mr. Greene, Bill, if you could make a courtesy call to Sharpe Hospital or their Cabinet Secretary and let me know what the result is from that.

Mr. Emery, I think I have told you about all I know. I am happy to answer any other questions. We are more than happy to work with you, to work on the budget process and look at it.

Ms. Sampson, why is this May 31<sup>st</sup> and not August?

Mr. Emery, for one thing, they switched over from Peachtree to Quick Books and it is not completed yet. The goal was to have it finished effective with the end of the year. Melinda finished with those statements late last night. I do have copies of June if you want them.

Ms. Bates, two months is not uncommon when you look at this kind of thing if you are a little behind.

Mr. Emery, I think you are pretty much on track with the switchover of the software but that created a little bit of a delay.

Ms. Tucker, week after next we will be working on that.

Mr. Greene, Bill your intent is to take what Marsha presented and resubmit, is that your plan?

Mr. Emery, I think June shows \$101,000 instead of \$110,000 for the year.

Mr. Monterosso, once this Peachtree is switched over I want to sit with Suttle & Stalnaker. The more you hear the more you learn. I didn't realize we haven't had a Chief Financial Officer (CFO) for at least a couple of years and it is critical from my perspective that we have a financial person here that can manage our finances and to work with Suttle & Stalnaker to help, not only to draft the budget, but to manage the budget and look at the invoices to be able to provide support for Joyce. Suttle & Stalnaker has done a great job for us in what they are charged to be doing. My intent is to get a financial officer here on staff, definitely an accountant who can help manage this and have Suttle & Stalnaker play the role of a pure auditor, and make sure we are doing what is right and that we are above the fray, that everything we do is open and transparent.

Mr. Emery, the independent auditor for financial statements that is something done annually and you had mentioned quarterly as opposed to the monthly, a reality checker, internal audit function maybe is the word. Unless you would charge us to do that, we won't be doing that. Whatever you feel you would need.

Ms. Bates, Cedric from my perspective what we need to know for the next meeting is, what happened to the \$110,000 and what happened to last year's and what the plan is to spend it. If not, then we will need to come up with a different percentage and recommend it.

Mr. Emery, obviously you can revise that budget.

Mr. Greene, do you have anything else Bill, or Everette do you have anything else?

Mr. Sullivan, I'm just curious Cedric, no offense to anyone, but why would it cost \$24,000 for a search committee to hire the guy we hired. Who is responsible for that?

Mr. Greene, it definitely wasn't me because I wouldn't have spent 50 cents.

Ms. Smith, it was WVARF's Board of Directors Executive Committee. That is who made the arrangements to do the search.

Mr. Greene, I have searched for many directors, in fact, I will be doing that when I get back; however, I have never paid a dime.

Mr. Sullivan, I was just curious, I don't have a problem with it but why do you have to spend \$24,000.

Ms. Smith, I wasn't a part of the meeting where they decided to do that. It is my understanding we were looking for someone that had very professional credentials to be able to serve in a unique position because WVARF is different than most other agencies. If we chose a company that does do searches for not-for-profit managers, I am not sure if it is exclusively, but it is a lot of what they do, that we would find someone that was most qualified. There was a history that Pac Tec had hired the same firm when they hired Greg Morris.

Mr. Sullivan, I don't have any problem with the person they hired, but my concern is why would they have to spend \$24,000?

Ms. Smith, we have to be aware that WVARF's Board of Directors are all volunteers just as we are and that takes up an enormous amount of time to do these types of searches. They felt the money would be well spent. That is the best I know, but that would be my answer.

Mr. Emery, the decision had to have been, can we do it ourselves or do we hire a search firm. That is just what the fees are for. You would have to pay a minimum of 20% of the person's compensation. That is just what the fees are for executive search firms.

Mr. Monterosso, it was actually \$24,900, they chose to do an hourly rate and the Board approved to do hourly. That consisted of developing job descriptions, investigating organizations strengths and weaknesses, recruitment efforts, looking through resumes, conducting first and second interviews, follow-up in three months or six months. Number of hours spent totaled up to that amount.

Mr. Greene, moving on.....

Mr. Emery and Ms. Tucker finished with their presentation and they left the meeting.

#### **COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT:**

Mr. Greene, I have nothing to report.

#### **EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT:**

No report as Mike Sheets is absent today.

#### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

Mr. Monterosso, at the last meeting we talked about what constitutes a new contract. We tabled the action and in between that meeting and this meeting, we searched for policy and guidance for the meaning for a new contract. I also reached out to a couple different State Use programs including Supra and Mike Weber who is the CEO, the former chair of Supra and former CEO of Austin, Texas, their State Use program.

A new contract is when there is a new site, a new scope-of-work, a new audit that takes place in a building. Sherrie and I spoke briefly prior to this meeting so as it relates to General Services, Building 88, is a new contract, new audit, and new scope-of-work. I am not sure which one is going to be presented today. Based on the Matrix, the Committee will have to vote on that as well as Division of Highways. The maintenance division is a separate building, separate dollars are being used, a whole different new scope-of-work. That will be considered a new contract, as well as the Office of Education, the warehouse which is a separate building, that's a new contract.

You have before you Barbers & Cosmetology. That will be a renewal. When I talked with Austin I think we used different terminology but they have basically four different types of contracts. New is new, everyone knows what a new contract is. They have renewal, amendment, change order. An amendment is when they are in this building CRP-A in this building and they are cleaning and we say, instead of doing these offices, why don't you do those back offices and start emptying the trash cans. That is not a new contract; we are going to amend it, expansion of a current contract. Within the same site, same location, it is easy.

They also have what is called a transfer, that means if CRP-A who was doing this for whatever reason and the manpower diminishes or they can't keep up with the process they will either engage in another CRP to step in or the current CRP-A would receive assistance from CRP-B, if you will, to fulfill the wishes of the customer. At the end of the day the customers' choices are first and foremost. I think it is important and I will draft this that we are very clear as Sherrie mentioned as well, that we are consistent in the way we interpret. I am going to draft it that we can't interpret it, that it is the way it is, so there is no confusion. What's a new contract, a renewal, and we are going to administer this the same way in Kanawha County as we do Calhoun County. It is important that it be consistent and be fair.

The matrix system is favorable for an incumbent if you will, an incumbent CRP as long as they are doing good work. It is just set up that way. Typically, anytime there is going to be a new contract I don't think it would negatively impact the relationship between the current CRP and that state agency. Sherrie and I spoke and we agreed that is how it should be. Leona will present some of those contracts and if we need to go out we will do it quickly so the state agencies are not held up any longer than they have to be held up and those individuals who are waiting to get to work can get to work.

I talked about Financial and that I need a CFO. Are you happy with that and does that make sense?

Cedric, Everette are you good with that?

Everette, yes

Cedric, I have always thought from day one to not have a CFO on deck – you're setting yourself up for failure.

Mr. Monterosso, we talked briefly about the finances, so I will move on. This is my perspective, and feel free to chime in, but I think it is odd that we divulge, but these contracts that we develop with the state agencies, it is my understanding that the Governor's Committee is the gate keeper, the protector of state agencies to make sure that it is truly Fair Market Value (FMV). Why any state or private customer receives a bid sheet of how many brooms, how many people, how many vacuum cleaners, doesn't make sense to me. When I go to NAPA and buy a spark plug I don't ask Napa, how much did you pay for it or how many fibers are in that box. I don't care how much it will cost, I am paying for a spark plug, and the state agency is paying for a clean building.

The Governor's Committee, in my mind, is the protector of state agencies. This is FMV and we have approved to make sure we came to the right conclusion and the state is getting the best value possible. We as a WVARF need to make sure that any CRP because we wear many hats here; we have to protect the interest of WVARF, protect the interest of state agencies as well as protect the interest of CRPs. If a contract says 700 trash cans are going to be cleaned and three years goes by and we are only cleaning 200 trash cans, we collectively have a responsibility to make sure that state agency is only paying for those 200 and not 700. That is a fair balance. What I am saying, I think because I have been part of this as a learning process, there are some different meanings with different state agencies. State agencies are focused on say five (5) vacuum cleaners here and why is there only three (3), there is three (3) because two (2) of them are being repaired and you are spending time justifying things that creates this sense of curiosity that am I getting the shaft here. Is this really FMV or are they just taking short cuts. Part of the responsibility we have with our contract specialists is to make sure the contract specialists are creating a process of internal audits or external audits constantly maintaining and nurturing those relationships with the state agencies. Being in constant communications with the CRPs to make sure that there are no adjustments or change orders in that contract and if there is, that's positive. There can be change orders and as long as we are being proactive and not reactive, I want to move away from because the sense that I am getting from state agencies is, well I have to use you guys. I want to move away from state agencies having to use us, to state agencies wanting to use us because they know they are getting that true value.

Ms. Bever, you are making excellent points Bill. This has been the topic of discussion in this community before. I'm glad you are bringing that back up. We certainly, as a CRP, have experienced some of what you have described with the state customers. We had one recently asked us, where is the buffer we are supposed to have. Well, we buff the floors when you are not here, so you are not going to see the buffer. That is how that works. The other part of this balance really has to do with having very, very clear, scopes-of-work so that our customers know what it is we should be doing for them and they can evaluate whether they are getting that clean building that they want. And that really goes to the scope-of-work. We have a number of contracts right now that don't have a scope-of-work attached to it. From the state customers perspective the only thing they have to evaluate is all this extra paperwork that we have been giving them and it tells them how many brooms, buffers, buffing pads are going to be used, what kind of trash liners are going to be used which is information that doesn't help them evaluate whether they have a clean building or not.



Ms. Smith, I do totally agree with what you are saying. I have been preaching for years that these service contracts need to be performance based and not based on how many brooms or how many sweepers we have, but whether or not they were doing the job. I agree with Cheri to a point. I am somewhat concerned about the scopes-of-work being too specific because it is a building to clean and it didn't need to be swept under my desk last night because I wasn't in there then that doesn't need to be swept every night. I do think having a performance based and also for you to have come to this conclusion and understand what the program was set up for and how it should be run in 30 days, I would be giving you a '**way to go**' if I were down there because that is absolutely what we need to do and most of the time that the CRPs are getting into issues with state agencies it is over these little things or someone saying, they are supposed to be here 1.5 hours, 3 days a week and just like what Cheri mentioned about the buffing of the floors. It might be an average of 1.5 hours, 3 days a week, but on Friday night you actually spend 3 hours in there because you are buffing floors. We just need to be careful that we are not being too specific with the scopes-of-work to the point where someone who is working late can say, they were there only an hour. The building is cleaner now and your floors got buffed miraculously somehow then the CRPs need to be able to defend what they are doing. Show the time sheet and the state is getting the services they are paying for.

Cheri, I agree with you. When Goodwill contracts with entities outside of WVARF and we provide a scope-of-work, there is always a section in there that talks about the quality standard.

Ms. Smith, I agree with you totally.

Mr. Monterosso, I guess what I am saying is, I think it is critical that we get our policies and procedures in place and the way we conduct business on a consistent basis. That will lead to credibility from the CRPs and WVARF, from the state agencies to the CRPs and to WVARF. The contracts ultimately lie with WVARF. Credibility and reputation lies with WVARF. CRPs have credibility and reputation to uphold as well. Ultimately, the contract lies with WVARF. I think it turns into a trust issue. The Governor's Committee trusting that we, as WVARF staff, will manage, will provide oversight of those contracts that what you guys approve as a committee, as it relates to FMV, as that is your role, will be adhered to and that we are allowed the opportunity as WVARF to build those alliances and those relationships with the CRPs to start making sure that the state agencies are getting what they ask for. Making sure that the scope-of-work is adhered to and that making sure that FMV is the first and foremost thing, but through those relationships I think what we are really after collectively is not only the FMV but overall value in quality of service.

Mr. Greene, you guys are doing this to yourself, you are preaching to the choir.

Ms. Bates, this Division of Rehabilitation serves as part of this Committee, not only is it the quality of work issue, but also the individuals with disabilities good work. My issue with it is, if I'm a CRP and I say I am going to clean the Capitol Complex, say 2000 hours, as a committee member, I am looking and I see referrals from the Division of Rehabilitation Services are going to go to work and there will be so many hours worked by those individuals and that they will receive minimum wage or better and that all of these things are in place.

I am concerned about quality but my number one concern is individuals with disabilities being employed. Here is what can happen with this approach. What can happen is that CRP-A can say I am going to clean DHHR in Martinsburg, they can say I am going to do it and I am going to do it for \$5,000 and you are going to get a clean building and originally twenty people were going to work. They only put ten people in there to get it done really quickly. The hours aren't there and then individuals with disabilities lose out because there is not as many hours to work, but the building is clean and there is an overhead that the CRP gets. The bottom line is, you are business people and you are getting to be better business people, which is a good thing. My issue is that, I like seeing those hours, I don't care about the brooms and all of that, I don't really care, but my issue is I want to know that people with disabilities are getting minimum wage and as many as possible working at a location. That is what I am here for.

Ms. Smith, I agree with you on that and we do have people at a higher level and can work more quickly. We also put some of the ones on jobs doing things they are able to do. If WVARF Contract Managers or WVARF's Directors saw and thought a CRP was trying to function for the quick money and not employ as many people, then we would need to talk to them. I don't think that happens. We have some people to work faster and to help out the ones that aren't as able to do those jobs. That goes back to CRPs and the state agencies can't really monitor that. I remember years ago when I first started, the Rest Area at Bridgeport, I wasn't on the Governor's Committee at the time, but one of the Governor's Committee members stopped and he asked something like "are these people disabled that are working these jobs" and the individual that was working said, "oh no, there is 1 or 2" but the reality was that DRS had referred every one of our employees there and they weren't focused on the disabilities, so to that gentleman it appears we weren't hiring people with disabilities, but we were. It is hard for someone who is not a part of the everyday operations to make that determination.

Ms. Bates, as the Governors Committee, we do need to focus on number of individuals with disabilities working on a project and the number of hours. You get your best people to do the best work so you can get things done quicker.

Ms. Smith, that is something the Governor's Committee could ask for. I will be glad to share that. I have no problem with the Governors Committee saying how many people you have working on this contract and how many hours are they are working.

Cheri, we already report that.

Ms. Bates, I know that you do, but I am saying, all through the years, my biggest concern is looking for a clean building and we are not looking at the number of hours that people work. We need to just make sure people with disabilities work.

Mr. Monterosso, I agree 100%. The only reason I am here they wanted to have the WVARF to get back on track of the focus of serving those individuals with disabilities. If I am in front of Brenda Bates I would rather talk about the value and the purpose of WVARF as opposed to what I had to do at Lottery yesterday. To look at line-by-line-by-line a contract that is this thick, what's this, what's that, and we are moving away from the purpose of why we are here.

Ms. Bates, I just want to make sure as a Committee we don't lose site that we continue to focus on the number of people we are hiring and also the number of hours they are working and are they making minimum wage.

Mr. Greene, you guys have done this to yourself, you are preaching to the choir buddy, you have done this to yourselves. We told Marsha six months ago, to bring us the thing you want to go to the state agencies. They may come back and say we want to see it. You guys have to do the first step, bring three sheets of paper of what you want to present to the state and if it is reasonable, we will approve it and if it is not, it probably won't. I think that somebody started sending all of this to DHHR and now we are trying to peel back from that, it is going to be a difficult task. I can just think of a couple of people that are going to say I want this because they all have Contract Managers and they all want everything because that is what they are used to. With your base of knowledge and your expertise you will be able to pull them off the ledge a little bit and get them back to the three sheets of paper.

Ms. Bates, bring to the committee what you want to show the State contract officers and what you are going to give to each state agency and then show us what you are bringing to the Committee. Those are two different things. What comes to the Committee doesn't have to go to the state agency.

Mr. Monterosso, you guys need to have full disclosure to make an informed decision. Nothing will change here in what we show to state agencies, when we open the doors what does the public see.

Ms. Sampson, if I were going to sign a contract with WVARF and you presented me with dollars I would want to know how you reached those dollars.

Mr. Monterosso, I think that is the purpose of the Governor's Committee.

Ms. Sampson, when we get that price, as to the space, square footage, that you all do, as Cedric said they don't need to know that detail. But, we as WVARF would need to know.

Mr. Sullivan, Bill, I don't know if I heard you right or not, but in your original statement you said something about we wanted to make this a volunteer operation. Certainly, our primary objective is to try to help people who have disabilities. If you go on a volunteer basis we won't be able to do what we are doing.

Mr. Greene, no, he is talking about mind set.

Mr. Monterosso, I'm glad you brought that up. What I said, they have to use the state use program, and there is no choice. But I want to change the mindset from them saying, oh I have to use this, which they don't have a choice, but you know what, I'm glad this is in place because I understand the value. Not only do I have to, but if I didn't have to, I would choose to anyway. That is what I meant.

Mr. Greene, just bring us three sheets of paper and we will approve it as long as it meets what we think is reasonable. The agency can look at it and ascertain what they are spending their money on and we will vote on it and we will approve it.

Mr. Monterosso, I will work with our contract people, a couple of CRPs, Cheri, Jan and anyone else who would want to volunteer and we will sit down one day and look at it and by the next meeting we will have something to present.

Ms. Smith, I will gladly volunteer to help with that.

Mr. Monterosso, I don't want to leave here without recognizing staff for they have worked extremely hard, putting this together and in place. We started packing and moving on a Monday and literally physically moving on a Wednesday and by the end of the day on Thursday we were almost in place. It is still a work in progress. I just wanted to recognize the staff for that. Talking about staff, I met with staff yesterday and I made staff aware of my intention and I wanted to meet with them before I made it public my intention to post all the positions that are here at WVARF so I can access the current skill sets of staff versus where I think we need to go as an organization. I wanted to make you aware of that.

We have already talked about the Financial Officer that I want to bring in place. Also, I wanted to ease Brenda's mind as it relates to what my intension is as far as focus being on individuals with disabilities.

I want to establish and create a new position such as a Customer Relations Manager. Anyone who is a customer, whether they buy something from us or receive a service, everyone is a customer. That person will provide oversight of contract managers or contract specialists, they will be skilled in legislative updates, will have knowledge of individuals with disabilities and preferably have a disability, as we can't discriminate obviously, one who has an intimate knowledge of individuals with disabilities. Assist with web design as what we have is embarrassing as 2005 was the last time it was updated. Someone who will have web experience, product design and implementation as it relates to CRPs. Marketing the association which means marketing individuals with disabilities. WVARF needs to be a presence and not just, oh, that's the State Use Program. I need to have specific staff in place to help me fulfill my mission of putting WVARF in a secure position as it relates to sustainability, as it relates to impacting individuals with disabilities, as it relates to increasing opportunities for CRPs which will include education and training of CRPs which will include the by-product and the end result of that will increase our credibility with state agencies, with legislators, with delegates, with everyone that touches this Association.

In addition to that position, we will make an effort to make sure that each of the CRPs have a relationship with Division of Rehabilitation Services (DRS) customers because it is one thing of saying, oh we serve X amount of people with handicap, it's a total other thing when I can go in front of a state agency or state decision makers and say, here is the value and purpose of what we do, but we can look at the relationships between CRPs and DRS as it comes to develop educational plans and employment plans and getting people through that career path. Developing pipelines, those workforce issues as well as those business related issues. This is another opportunity that I am exploring.

I will develop new job descriptions within the next 30 days and I have asked the current staff to provide me their resumes by Monday of their skillsets and their history. To make sure that there is a consistent audit over continual growth from a platform and opportunity, product of implementation, product of design. When we are looking at contracts, we need to look at contracts not only from the service side but the commodity side. I think there is no better way of protecting or enhancing CRPs opportunities by knowing the products, knowing the service that they deliver. We don't have to increase overhead, what we need to do is increase volume. If we increase volume, that will increase profit. I know we are non-profit but the bottom line, we are not for charity. We need to have key position in place. That is my intentions.

Mr. Greene, you are going to hire a CFO and this other position in-house?

Mr. Monterosso, yes, I am not going to pay another \$24,000 to someone else to make my decision.

## **CONTRACT PRESENTATIONS:**

### **Northern Contracts**

Sherri Briggs

1. Bureau of Child Support Enforcement (BCSE) Sutton, WV. CRP is Precision Services  
2011-2012 contract annual \$8,204.40  
2012-2013 contract annual \$8,204.40  
No changes or increases for FY2012- 2013. Annual amount remains the same.  
11 month contract amount being voted on is \$7,520.70  
 $\$683.70 \times 11 \text{ months} = \$7,520.70$
2. Bureau of Child Support Enforcement (BCSE) Morgantown, WV.  
CRP is Pace Enterprise  
2011-2012 contract annual amount of \$7,863.00  
2012-2013 contract annual amount is \$8,001.48  
An annual increase of \$138.48. This equals monthly increase of \$11.54 per month for added floor care service, workers compensation and unemployment increases.  
11 month contract being voted on is \$7,334.69  
 $\$666.79 \times 11 \text{ months} = \$7,418.40$

### **MOTION #2**

**Mr. Sullivan made a motion to approve these two Bureau of Child Support Enforcement contracts. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion passed.**

Jan abstained from voting on the following:

3. Bureau of Child Support Enforcement (BCSE) Middletown Mall, Fairmont, WV.  
CRP is Op Shop.  
2011-2012 contract annual amount of \$7,978.68  
2012-2013 contract annual amount of \$8,600.04  
An annual increase of \$621.36, which equals monthly increase of \$51.78 per month for added floor care service and supplies. The Op Shop did stripping & waxing 2 times a year.  
11 month contract being voted on is \$7,883.37 which is  $\$716.67 \times 11 = \$7,883.37$ .

Sherrie, Jan and I had met and as you were all talking about brooms, nuts and bolts, there are other CRPs that are doing other things and this particular contract it doesn't have the added things, for instance, the OP Shop does do a grout cleaning and it is not on this.

Sherrie, Air National Guard, Martinsburg, WV has requested a one-time floor cleaning of their facility. If you remember Cedric, they had opted to pull out and when the Sergeant called me I was happy to hear that we may get our foot back in that door to have a conversation. These prices were drawn up and Sergeant has already seen them, approved them as well as the Developmental Center also did.

Mr. Greene, the person that they hired was a tech guy and they thought he was going to do all this great stuff, well he has told them, this is not what I do. It could possibly be a grievance to have him doing that. I knew he was never going to do this floor.

Sherrie, they asked for floors to be buffed and they have not been buffed now for two years and also do the stripping and waxing. They are going in and doing the 15,789 sq. ft. to be stripped/waxed/spray buffed, to be performed and completed / August 2012 – October 2012. The CRP is Developmental Center and Workshop. The contract amount being voted on is \$6,297.58. The Sergeant did ask for the Developmental Center as they liked the way they cleaned their floors previously and kept their shower rooms cleaned.

### **MOTION #3**

**Mr. Sullivan made a motion to approve #3, the Middletown Mall in Fairmont, WV. Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.**

### **MOTION #4**

**Mr. Smith moved to approve the Air National Guard in Martinsburg, WV. Mr. Sullivan seconded. Motion passed.**

## **Southern Contracts**

Leona Hoffmann

1. Renewal contract for WV Barbers and Cosmetologists, Dunbar, WV  
\$118.25 per month, \$1,240.85 (10 Months 15 Days)  
Service – 1 day per week  
Customer cancelled service due to budget issues back in January.  
2011-2012 contract \$118.25 per month, \$1,421.26 annual

They asked that Goodwill pick up services again. They found some money and requested the amount be the same due to their budget, \$118.25.

**MOTION #5**

**Mr. Sullivan made a motion to approve. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion passed.**

2. New contract for DHHR, Region 4 in Union, WV.  
\$524.65 per month, \$5,453.50 (10 months 12 days)  
Service they have asked for is they need someone 3 days per week, 2 hours a day. Monday, Wednesday and Friday; however, those days could change.

**MOTION #6**

**Mr. Sullivan made a motion to approve. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion passed.**

Ms. Hoffman, Qualifying Matrix – DHHR in Princeton, WV has requested 555 chairs be scrubbed and cleaned. The chairs are twelve (12) years old and have never been cleaned. The CRP in this area was unable to perform this task; therefore, a RFI was sent out and two CRPs are interested.

Mr. Sullivan, how much per chair?

Ms. Hoffman, \$5.00 per chair at a total cost per \$2,888.78.

**MOTION #7**

**Ms. Smith, I move we approve CRP #1, DHHR, Princeton, WV. Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.**

Leona, CRP #1 is Lillian James Learning Center.

Leona, second Qualifying Matrix is General Services Division, Building 88 at 7 Players Club Drive in Charleston, WV.

**MOTION #8**

**Ms. Smith made a motion to approve CRP #2, General Services, Building 88, Charleston, WV. Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.**

Leona, CRP #2 is Goodwill Industries of Kanawha Valley. This is a big building consisting of 11,000 sq. ft. janitorial. Miner's, Health & Safety is on the second floor and the first floor is Forestry Division. Hopefully, 2 or 3 people will be employed in that building.

Mr. Greene, we bought that building actually.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

None

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Ms. Bever, I think we mentioned the last time we were talking a little about the background check issue. Legislation during the last session was passed required background checks on all contractors in the Capitol Complex and we had a 90-day period to get that in order. That started July 1, 2012. We are quickly coming up to that and we don't have a mechanism to get our contract workers through us at that site do a background check. The background checks at the Capitol that are required for all contract workers not just WVARF contract workers but all, what is our mechanism through WVARF to make sure that we have folks through a process.

Ms. Hoffman, I apologize, I don't know, but we have to get on that.

Ms. Bever, as 90 days is coming up.

Mr. Greene, I don't think DMAPS has that.

Leona, I think L1 Solutions.

Ms. Bever, they have the contract for this as well.

Mr. Greene, I think it is Department of Military Affairs and Public Safety (DMAPS). I believe it is Protective Services, you can call the Director, Randy Mayhew and he will have good information and I feel sure he will help us on that. His telephone number is (304) 382-6024.

Mr. Monterosso, I will contact him.



Ms. Bever, I think what the Legislation did was they changed the wording so it was a National background check. We were doing previously with State Police. I don't know what other contractors were doing but that is what we were doing. This will be more expensive, around \$40.00.

Ms. Hoffmann, I think about \$100.00.

Mr. Greene, what is your main concern?

Ms. Bever, first of all, that there is a mechanism to comply.

Mr. Greene, probably if there isn't it will probably revert back to you.

Ms. Bever, you mean to pay for it?

Mr. Greene, right.

Ms. Bever, yes that is the second concern. If these are running \$100.00 per person and we have 130 people that is a fairly sizeable chunk of change, is that going to cause change orders to come through your Committee to ensure that the contracts are covering that cost?

Mr. Greene, all the temps that comes from Manpower. Some places already have mechanisms already inside their entity.

Mr. Monterosso, it started as I understand it, they introduced e-verify and legalization and all that and they dovetailed legislation to do the full background so I will call him.

Mr. Bever, I'm elated we are getting in the temporary services side of the contracts. We are getting assignments from temporary services that are requesting background checks; I think I brought this up the last time. When a CRP gets a job order for a temp contract they have 48 hours to fill it. So if you are adding the process of background checking unless you have a whole pool full sitting on the side waiting for a temp job, it is going to be a lot of waivers on the temp side, because there is no way to get a temp background check back and cleared within 48 hours.

Mr. Sullivan, are they going to do a drug test too?

Ms. Bever, they may, who knows, they may go that route as well. I am concerned about that on the temp side because as Bill brought up earlier, I do think there are some state customers who are feeling like they have to use this program and perhaps have some resentment about that. It would be lovely to move to a position where they want to be because they are getting value out of it and they agree with what the program is about. But, I am afraid this might become a mechanism for lots of waivers by adding this extra thing to it.

Mr. Greene, the background check?

Ms. Bever, yes and interestingly enough some of the job orders that we are getting for temps are for positions that we have had job orders for before in previous years that never required a background check.

Ms. Sampson, you mentioned legislation, the legislation itself probably didn't determine between employees or full time, temporary or anything did it?

Ms. Bever, I recall the legislation was around just the Capitol and just contractors. This thing I am talking about with the temporary services is not a legislatively required thing at all. It is just all of a sudden.

Ms. Sampson, if you had to use somebody temporary to fulfill your contract is that.....

Ms. Bever, as a contractor I would still have to have the background check. I was actually looking in our packets from previous months and I believe we had a waiver report and that is not in here so I can't tell, maybe Mary would know on the temp side of things if she has been having to give more waivers as a result of some of this. It is a concern Everette, in that, this program is about employing people with disabilities. If we put that extra hurdle in place the likelihood of people with disabilities getting into those jobs has just gone down dramatically.

Ms. Bates, the legislation is the legislation; the issue is how to pay for it. We can't say, you don't have to do it. Agencies have a right to ask for it regardless. I guess the issue becomes how they pay for it and if the Governor's Committee will approve of change order to pay for it. That is the bottom line.

Mr. Greene, I just think that it is a new cost of business. The Governor has asked for 7.5% in the executive branch and I think this could be problematic towards the agencies.

Ms. Bates, other contractors may not be putting the expense in the contracts.

Mr. Greene, you are just not seeing it.

Ms. Bates, I think a change order would not be a good thing. But to include it into your original contract which they could have done for July and it would have been ok but to do a change order is going to be difficult.

Mr. Greene, get with Randy and he can tell you what the process is. I just think with all the shootings and everything going on around the world, I just think people are becoming more and more aware of their surroundings.

Ms. Bates, in the Randolph-Shepherd program we do it for every Federal building. It is just a cost of business and the vendors who have businesses have to do it for all their employees. And that is much more extensive.

Mr. Sullivan, in the construction trades, you have to have a green card before you can go to work showing you are drug free before you can go to work on a construction project.

Ms. Bever, whatever Goodwill can do to help come up with a solution that works that continues to preserve the integrity of this program which is putting people with disabilities to work, please call on us and we will be happy to help. Goodwill does do some background and drug testing above and beyond what's required. A lot of people with disabilities also have criminal backgrounds by the way. But we certainly don't want to put them into work positions where they are not going to be successful. It behooves us as well to know up front what is in a person's background so we can help match them to the right place.

Mr. Greene, let me know Bill what the plan is or what you think we need to do and we will let the rest of the Committee know.

**MOTION #9**

**Mr. Sullivan made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.**