

MEETING MINUTES

February 20, 2013

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. February 20, 2013 at the Embassy Suites located at 300 Court Street, Charleston, West Virginia.

ATTENDANCE:

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

WVARF Staff: William "Bill" Monterosso
Cyndi Auth
Mark Jackson
Gary Wolfe

Absent: Phillip Mason

Guests: WVARF Board

COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT:

Mr. Greene, I want to introduce Kim Nuckles, she is the Coordinator of the Americans Disability Act (ADA) for the State of West Virginia. I wanted you to meet her and know she is someone who could make sure you are in compliance with rules and regulations both from the state and federal level.

Mr. Greene, do we have an approval of the minutes from our January meeting?

MOTION #1

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

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT:

\$5,055.00 -	Annual Allocation
702.17 -	Disbursement
<u>276.86 -</u>	Transfer Out
\$4,075.97 -	Balance Remaining

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Mr. Monterosso, I will reiterate from our last meeting that we agreed to that calculation of how the formula 4.1% was derived, whether you multiplied by 4.1 or divide by 9.59. Logistics would tell you there won't be a difference, but math wise there is a difference. As far as our continued effort to be as transparent as possible to build the credibility between Purchasing, DOA, state agencies, WVARF and CRPs and to maintain the diligence that we were putting forth in the contract it was cleaner because it was brought up by a couple of CRPs that there is really a difference in the 4.1%. It didn't impact the contract of the CRPs, they receive the same amount of money, what it did impact was the amount that WVARF received. It was to the tune of \$1.75 per thousand which doesn't seem like a lot of money, but you start adding zero's to that \$1,000 and it starts adding up. We decided to revert back to the calculation of multiplying by 4.1% which was the actual cost. NISH uses division of 9.59, SUPRA uses 4.1%. Both are approved and both are legitimate. It is just a matter of what you want to do. NISH is actually getting some push back and they are looking at converting back multiplied by the 4.1%. It didn't impact the CRPs, what it did, it generated additional revenue not intentionally, it is just the method which you do for the CNA. So we have changed that back.

For those of you who knew Mike Sheets with the Purchasing Division, Don Arrick has replaced Mike on this CNA Committee. Mike, Don and I have a good relationship. It was agreed that we would enter into a 6-month contract and in January we would do the new contracts so those costs would be reflected.

One other thing we continue to do is look at the existing contracts, look at modifying the renewals coming up. This is a crazy, hectic time for us right now. It is not the easiest time in the world and it is not the most glamorous job in the world for the staff to be knee deep in those contracts and the formulas and projections and our people are about worn out but it is worth taking the time to do the contracts right. It is a lot of change and hopefully we will get through it sooner than later.

Had a good meeting with DRS last week with the Rehabilitation Committee to forge those relationships with CRPs. I work with LuAnn at DRS to really create opportunities for those meetings to occur for that accountability to be there and do it in a collective way so they see that the CRPs and DRS at the leadership level are collective and together in this drive. We left that meeting feeling very positive.

We went to SUPRA and that was a great opportunity.

This afternoon Floyd Nesse who is my counterpart in New Jersey will come to talk about how he built his organization from about \$6M annually to about \$30M. How did he do that? How do we as CRPs look to products that state agencies are buying and WVARF as an association create those mechanisms to help some of the CRPs either change that model or create opportunities for them to enter into that product or service? Right now there are a lot of things we are doing and I think we are moving in the right direction, it is just a lot of work.

Mr. Greene, we appreciate your professionalism and your staff, I think you have done a great job selecting the members of your staff. I think they are very intelligent, very engaged and I think they are very professional. I don't know if you could have made a better selection for your staff. Just so everyone knows, he will call once a week sometimes twice a week and we will try to link up or talk on the phone so we can gauge of where he is at and what he is doing, he always keeps me in the loop. He doesn't make a move without going through the Purchasing Division to make sure he is in accordance with Purchasing rules and regulations and we appreciate that because it makes it a lot easier when we get to this monthly meeting. I think you guys are doing a great job and I think the level of professionalism and just the level of engagement has changed drastically and for the better and I appreciate that and I think the Committee does as well. I think you are on the right track.

Mr. Greene, Mr. Nesse is from New Jersey and it is always nice to stay in your comfort zone but when you start thinking outside the box and see what Kentucky, Ohio and New Jersey, how is it they went from one point to another point in a matter of three (3) years or five years (5) and how can the State of West Virginia do that. I think it is more customer service orientated finding out what the customer wants verses what you want to sell. What you want to sell is entertaining but if nobody wants to buy it then there is no profit there. We appreciate all your hard work and your staff because I don't know if you could have picked a better contact person and better staff to work with CRPs.

Lastly, I bragged about this last month but I will say it very quickly. We had lunch, Brenda Bates and I and some other Committee members as Bill and his staff over the Christmas holidays brought lunch in for us. I always talk good about people who feed me anyway. I will tell you this, it was a very delicious lunch and a very nice time and can just tell under Bill's leadership we are going in the right direction and we certainly do appreciate it from the Committee's standpoint. I believe the state of West Virginia also appreciates as well because there is something to be said about being engaged, not everybody is. I think you have done well in selecting your staff so we appreciate your efforts.

CONTRACT PRESENTATIONS:

Ms. Auth, we have two new contracts. WV Geological Economic Survey in Morgantown. Due to internal staffing changes, the agency did not sign the contract presented. They requested a reduction in the scope-of-work and are now requesting a day porter for janitorial service for eight hours one day per week.

The contract consists of (6,034 sq. ft.) and is primarily for trash removal, floor care and select cleaning projects in support of the maintenance department. Supplies and equipment will be provided by the state agency. Priced through traditional ISSA work loading the monthly rate is \$370.02.

An RFI was released on December 12, 2012. PACE Enterprises was the only respondent. The contract has been developed for March 1 – June 30, 2013.

MOTION #2

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

Division of Rehabilitation Services, Romney, WV. The DRS field office in Romney is requesting to add janitorial service for the first time. The opportunity was generated and brought to WVARF by the Developmental Center and Workshop. The building is 2,012 sq. ft. and calls for approximately three (3) hours of service daily. This includes basic janitorial service and annual carpet care. The contract is developed for service from March 1 – June 30, 2013. The monthly rate is \$770.07.

MOTION #3

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

Change order for Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in Bridgeport. The Randolph County Sheltered Workshop provided service at the previous location and will continue to provide service at the new location. At 4,960 sq. ft., the scope-of-work results in approximately 3.5 hours daily. This includes basic janitorial services and annual floor care. The contract period is submitted for February 11 – June 30. Although WVARF was aware the office may be moving, we received notice from DEP staff in December that they were not relocating. At the end of January, notice was received that the move would occur and requested not to have service interrupted and to begin February 11, 2013. The monthly rate is \$977.70.

MOTION #4

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

Mr. Greene, the reason we are doing these individually instead of going through all five or ten of them together is just in case we would have a specific issue on one of the contracts.

Renewals: Stream Access

Two (2) contracts being presented for renewal of Stream Access including a statewide contract of 107 sites which includes six (6) new sites for this year and a separately funded contract for Kanawha Falls/New River. WVARF staff worked closely with DNR on this process as well as the District Biologist to confirm their needs. Due to their high satisfaction with the work of CRPs providing that they are interested in expanding and resulted in five (5) additional contracts and this past week they wanted to add a sixth site. The budget for the statewide contract was increased from \$125.00 to \$135,000.

In preparing for annual renewal, staff noted a few areas for modifications including:

- Updating pricing for gas/oil;
- Adding a few necessary safety items; and
- Standardizing of pricing factors across the contracts (mileage rates, equipment cost).

Gas/Oil – Previously, the gas and oil price allocation was \$2.75 per gallon on previous contracts. Based on average local prices over the past year for the combination of gas and oil, the proposed price is \$5.50. To optimize equipment performance, 90 octane gas is recommended at WV average price of 4.099. Although prices for two (2) cycle oil varies, ranges for 3.2 oz. (to meet 40:1 ratio per gallon) is between \$1 - \$4. Pre-mix prices would be higher.

Safety Items, line items were added for first aid kits and gloves. We have looked at pricing comparisons across the board. We compared Grainger, retail stores and we have had consultation with CRPs regarding their sources to come up with a balance of quality and pricing.

Standardization

- Mileage rates varied from .47 to .505 across the contracts. All contracts were developed at the .505 rate.
- Reimbursement for equipment costs was standardized for purchase and maintenance of weed eaters. Also looking at the Supervisor rates. A standard \$150 annual cost was factored for three (3) year replacement.

NOTE: Changes were not made to hours of work, wages, mileage, and additional hours approved by DRS. Inventory information was requested and reviewed with CRPs. Several CRPs are utilizing additional equipment; however, additional equipment cost is not currently factored. Discussion was held with Division of National Resources (DNR) staff regarding the variance of need across sites. This contract will be monitored this coming year to determine if any additional changes are needed to ensure efficient and accurate costing.

NOTE: The pricing sheet format was adjusted to reflect the actual cost per site rather than statewide averages. This was done to maintain accuracy and transparency of cost.

Ms. Smith, DNR and CRPs have all agreed to these costs?

Ms. Auth, all of the CRPs will be making approximately 3% more. The average is 3% more across the board.

MOTION #5

Mr. Sullivan moved to approve. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion passed.

Ms. Smith, are we going to approve each individually?

Mr. Greene, I have some questions....

Ms. Auth, several factors looking at these contracts. We have met and talked with DNR about the increase and they are fine with it.

Ms. Smith, you already have here the recommendation for each individual site. With that being said I will second the motion.

Mr. Greene, I just have some general questions. First of all, I appreciate you getting this to us early this morning. Is there a mechanism in place to ensure that this 90% octane is exactly – is there a process in place to be sure that is what the state is paying for and not 98%?

Ms. Auth, quality of standards in place of what we would do.

Mr. Greene, is that a yes?

Ms. Auth, we will be auditing.

Mr. Greene, 1) if there is a policy/procedure in place to ensure that is happening; and 2) is this what we are basing this mileage rate on? Is that based off the Federal?

Ms. Auth, it is actually between the Federal and the State.

Mr. Greene, because the state is .47.

Mr. Monterosso, the federal is .54 or .55.

Mr. Sullivan, I think the federal is .56.

Ms. Cleek, if it is .47 for the state, how would that affect the overall cost of things?

Ms. Smith, that is one of the reasons why I asked if DNR had agreed to this.

Mr. Monterosso, there are several reasons, a) the wages didn't go up; and b) as some of you know, the beauty of West Virginia is mostly rural and there is considerable amount of travel for individuals. We didn't want to put a particular region at a disadvantage because they have to travel 50-60 miles to a site verses someone else having to drive one mile to a site. Since the wages didn't increase, as well as speaking with DNR to say is this a fair balance.

Mr. Greene, I just don't know that justifies from .47 to .50.

Mr. Monterosso, so that .50 has been approved in the past.

Mr. Greene, it has been? Does anyone else have any questions about that?

Mr. Sullivan, I would just think if the individual is going to drive his own car and the federal people allow increased amount I don't know why the state wouldn't pay .56 because gas is going to be \$4.00 a gallon pretty soon and these people who drive their own car drives it as a benefit to the state not to themselves. I personally think they should get the full amount allowed by the federal level.

Ms. Smith, I think you all have tried to find a middle ground and knowing that rate has been approved in the past, I think your assumption was good that we should be able to go ahead with that on these contracts again. I would like to see it stay where it is.

Mr. Sheets, Don do you have any concerns.

Don, I have the same concerns you did about it being higher than the state rate but I wasn't aware that it was approved at the higher rate on previous contracts.

Ms. Cleek, could they do a change order to increase the state rate if it would go up to .48 as an example.

Ms. Smith, I think there have been some adjustments in the contract in the past - it would say the state rate.

Mr. Green, just go back to \$2.75 per gallon and the proposed is \$5.50, is that correct?

Ms. Auth, part of that was the assumption that they would be purchasing the gas from state sources and would get a discount on that but the reality is, where are the CRPs located and the mileage would actually generate more cost.

Ms. Smith, in our area the comptroller stopped us from buying gas from their pumps and I don't know if that is throughout the state. We used to, for our rest area buy the gas from them but we are no longer allowed to do that. I don't know if that is happening other places or not.

Mr. Greene, so DNR is in agreement with it?

Ms. Auth, they didn't say that was a problem.

Mr. Greene, that just seems huge to me. To go from \$2.75 to \$5.50.

Mr. Arrick, at the \$2.75 did we specify a higher octane gas or was it a lower octane? I'm just curious because I am having a problem also from \$2.75 to \$5.50.

Ms. Smith, how long has it been since these contracts have really been looked at and changed? I think that may be part of the problem. I know it is with the rest areas that they weren't being looked at. Is that the case here that they haven't been adjusted for a good while?

Ms. Auth, they haven't been adjusted for a long time, certain people brought that to my attention as a discussion point last year.

Ms. Smith, since we have CRP membership here, are any of you allowed to purchase gas from the local state

CRP in attendance, it has been at least five (5) years and no we are not allowed to purchase gas from state gas pumps.

Ms. Smith, I think that makes a huge difference because when these were originally designed we were purchasing from the state and the gas was of course so much lower, but now I don't think any of us are doing that, certainly none of us here in the room.

Mr. Monterosso, that is a valid point. We are diligent about looking at these contracts, so we went and DNR said this is fine, but you have to remember, the last Governor's Committee meeting we came and said we reduced a particular contract almost in half and brought to Purchasing Division and to the Department of Highways, so it is not that we are gouging one way or the other, we are being fair across the board. Also gas has increased every single day for the last month.

Mr. Greene, your argument, I get it. I get that the contracts haven't been looked at for five (5) years or ten (10) years. The problem that you have here, you guys can't tell me definitively that DNR approved it, that would be the first thing. The second concern I have is that to go from \$2.75 to \$5.50 I find it hard to believe, I may be wrong but I find it hard to believe that DNR can afford to do this. I find it hard to believe they could find the money to do this.

Ms. Smith, they must be enthusiastic about what they are receiving.

Mr. Monterosso, yes because they gave us six (6) additional contracts.

Ms. Smith, they gave us six (6) more sites, they must be able to afford it.

Ms. Auth, they have a cap on what they can spend. The new additional sites they were factored in the cost.

Mr. Monterosso, that \$5.50 it is actually \$3.75 for gas – gas is already higher than that per gallon and \$1.75 for oil. That is for lower octane.

Ms. Smith, I am not really aware of where the stream accesses are but I am assuming they are a little difficult to get to and that it is wear and tear on vehicles and things like that also.

Mr. Greene, what I am telling you is that I find it hard to believe that DNR has the money to go from \$2.75 to \$5.50; I just find that hard to believe.

Ms. Smith, they set a cap of \$135,000 and then WVARF worked back from that and I think came to a conclusion that DNR was happy with it.

Mr. Greene, no we have never concluded that Ms. Jan.

Ms. Smith, that is what I heard from Cyndi.

Mark, I talked to Mr. Preston on the phone last night and he is the head biologist and he was good with the pricing, even with the gas and oil at \$5.50 a gallon.

Mr. Greene, we will go ahead and make a motion but I want to see an email from them stating they agree with this. We can talk about this until the cows come home but I know from having been in state government, when something goes from \$2.75 to \$5.50 this is a huge deal and I don't want to be doing anything without the agencies approve consent. We are just wasting our time if we approve it and I try to force DNR's hand because they are going to come back and say, hey - on what authority. If you guys get me an email, I'm good with it.

Ms. Auth, I talked to Bret Preston and he is my source of information, so when you asked me that I hesitated because of who he may have talked to so that is the only reason I had hesitation.

Mr. Greene, what I would suggest to you is go back with the email and say they had a question about this and say are we good. That is all I need. I don't want someone coming back and saying we approved without their approval.

Ms. Cleek, I would be questioning about the increase at my place at work, definitely.

Ms. Smith, I think that is what you need to do from now on because most of the contracts need looked at in the way WVARF is examining them now. I think we are establishing with Purchasing that we are trying to make these as appropriate and to the good of both sides but I think an email from now on when you come in with something that is this big of a change, that will make it easier.

Statewide Contract

Ms. Auth, WVARF is presenting for review and approval the statewide stream access contract. DNR has set a budget not to exceed \$135,000. This proposal covers 107 sites including six (6) new sites. The proposed price is \$133,762.30. All previous sites will continue to be maintained by the same CRPs. This includes:

Buckhannon Upshur Sheltered Workshop (6)
Clay County Services (5)
Developmental Center and Workshop (17)
East Ridge (8)
Gateway Industries (8)
Goodwill of Kanawha Valley (16)
Goodwill of Huntington (6)
Integrated Services (7)
Randolph County Sheltered Workshop (10)
SW Resources (18)

Ms. Auth, RFI's were released with active bidding on the new sites including several CRPs looking to initiate stream access service. Matrix forms were completed for each new site.

- Edward Run Pond – Recommend Developmental Center and Workshop
- Hanging Rock on the South Branch River – Recommend Developmental Center & Workshop
- River Road on Buckhannon River (Upshur County) – Recommend Buckhannon Upshur

Buckhannon Upshur	Matrix Score: 100
ARC of Harrison County	Matrix Score: 59

- Meadowbrook on West Fork (located near Bridgeport) – Recommend Randolph County

ARC of Harrison County	Matrix Score: 63
Randolph County Workshop	Matrix Score: 75

- O'Brien Lake in Jackson County – Recommend Goodwill of Kanawha Valley

JCDC	Matrix Score: 63
SW Resources	Matrix Score: 90
Goodwill of Kanawha Valley	Matrix Score: 95

- Meadow Creek (Summers County) – Recommend Gateway Industries

Integrated Resources	Matrix Score: 75
Gateway Industries	Matrix Score: 90
Lillian James	Matrix Score: 72.5
Randolph County	Matrix Score: 75
Mercer County	Matrix Score: 65

MOTION #6

Ms. Smith, I move to approve those recommendations. Mr. Sullivan seconded. Motion passed.

Ms. Auth, that concludes the statewide stream access contracts. Pricing that from March 1st – December 31st although most of these are eight (8) month contracts. The proposed price is \$133,762.13.

Mr. Greene, say that number again please.

Ms. Auth, \$133,762.13.

MOTION #7

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

Ms. Auth, a separately funded Stream Access contract is developed for Kanawha Falls/New River. This contract is served by Clay County Services. This is a 12-month contract from January 1 – December 31 of this year. It was an oversight on our part as well as DNR. It was because the others were eight (8) months and we didn't realize it was up for renewal. Ms. Sampson who is with Clay County Services brought that to our attention. Very few adjustments were made from last year's contract. These changes were addressed above and include gas/oil price increase and addition of first aid kit and gloves. The price is \$21,567.36. DNR's budget for this project is not to exceed \$25,000.

MOTION #8

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

FINANCIAL REPORT:

Mr. Monterosso, Cyndi and I are looking forward to moving on to what she was hired for. This budget is not my forte, my goal is to make sure we are not spending money we don't have. To make sure we utilize the money and look at other opportunities to use the different resources that we have. Basically, we are operating at about 49% through December 31st which is exactly where we should be. We are half way through the year and should be at 50% so we are in decent shape.

We had a couple of questions that I am going to be finding clarifications for. On the Statement of Financial Position the \$412,554.46 is reflected; however, it is not reflected on the consolidated. I will work with Melinda and get answers to all those questions and I have a call out to Melinda. There was a question on space, what does space mean and actually that is the first time that I have seen space on there. I'm assuming that it is storage but I am not going to assume that. Ms. Bever asked what is discretionary, and that is not my slush fund, but I will find out what discretionary is. I'm kicking myself right now because I should have taken more time to look at this. I looked at it briefly and making sure we are paying the bills and working very hard to make sure the CRPs are getting their invoices back to them on time. We are constantly changing and evolving and Cedric can attest to this but we have changed this budget quite a bit in the way it is constructed so that the Governor's Committee can interpret it and we can see how much money we spend at any given time, what percentages against the annual budget. Two months ago you didn't have that information. You couldn't interpret where we are, if we are on track, are we over or under. It wasn't the easiest thing to follow.

We are converting and we are almost there from Preach Tree to QuickBooks. All of December is in here. The last budget which was two weeks ago we didn't have all of December's in there yet. Melinda has gone in there and being thoughtful in how do we allocate some of those dollars, what line item and where does it really need to go to. And, as you are looking through those line items it is difficult because you will say, we are 817% over this, and we are 17,000 percent over this line. It really doesn't mean a whole heck of a lot because the budget was developed last year by my predecessor and the direction and the vision was totally different. There were no dollars, hardly any dollars for staff training and staff training is critical. Continual growth is critical for licensing, for credentialing, for membership. Those things are critical. Travel, it is critical that CRPs are communicating with the contract staff or the business liaisons. It is critical that business liaisons are out there creating opportunities for CRPs and the only way they can do that is understanding the services and products. So travel has gone up significantly.

One of the things we wanted to show you is the website and one of the things we are going to be putting on that website is the calendar so you guys will know this is the Governor's Committee, CRPS will know what we are doing, who we are going to be impacting, where are we going to be at any given time. We're not going to be filling it in every five minutes, we are not going to put GPS tracking systems on the staff but it will be a weekly or monthly update of where we are going, where we have been. Some of the positive things as far as training opportunities, educational opportunities, critical events such as legislative events, Governor's Committee dates. A lot of different things will be on that calendar. Basically, we are running at about 49%.

I have some homework to figure out, what is space, what is discretionary, and we need to reflect that \$412,000 in the consolidated budget. We are still showing some expenses that have been paid that we are not sure if we need to continue to show and I will continue to work with Melinda on taking the time to do that. There are no excuses but we are knee deep in a lot of different things. Melinda was in there to make sure that the budget was created and I will do my homework and make sure you guys, as well as the Board has a full understanding of where those dollars are, what this space and discretionary means and why wasn't 4/12 captured in the consolidated report. I will do that all today or it will be done this week. The budget is what it is and it is in front of you and if you have any questions, I will be glad to entertain those other than the ones I pointed out for you.

MOTION #9

Mr. Sullivan made a motion to accept the financial report. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Monterosso, a comment – these contracts are tedious and sometimes difficult. It is not rocket science but in a lot of ways it is. They are very meticulous and detailed and thoughtful on putting those contracts together so the CRPs are getting fair market value. And that is the key, are the CRPs truly getting fair market value as opposed to the state agencies only getting fair market value, because for years the CRPs have been underpricing. For years these contracts have gone on and on and on without anyone looking at them. That is why I wanted to have the Governor's Committee as part of the agenda of the full board so we can show that we are working, we all have the same outcome of creating opportunities for individuals with disabilities. To be as transparent as we possibly can, there is nothing to hide, how can we utilize each other to move forward and one of the things that I wanted to make clear to the CRPs was, because of the relationship that we now have with Purchasing they have agreed that we don't have to burden state agencies with how many brooms, how many of that and keeping track of brooms as opposed to – is the building clean and what is the cost and knowing that the Governor's Committee is protecting their interest in the fair market value and Purchasing said we don't need everything that you are giving us so we are working with Purchasing to make sure that we are up front and above board that this is what we have, we will share with you anything that you want. I wanted to say that to make sure everyone knows that this is a good place to be right now as far as having that opportunity if we are struggling or in trouble.

When I was in Florida I don't know if this has always been this way but we had a contract situation that the language hadn't been changed in years and Mike Sheets called and said, Bill if I pass this along now you are limiting yourself and I'll have to void this contract. If you want I can make some minor changes for you and what it will do will quadruple the opportunities for the volume of the mats, that is what it was over, mats for the central office for the Capitol. That in itself reaps benefits to expand to make sure that Purchasing is looking out for our interest as well and they are keeping a watchful eye and attuned to the fact that, – wait a minute, is the State Use Program getting everything that they should be getting. Are the state agencies utilizing the legislation and we have also had a discussion of not shoving the legislation down state agencies throat. But they want to use this as opposed to having to use this. These types of things allow for those opportunities to happen.

Mr. Greene, I think relationships certainly make it so that we work better together and I think it is important that the CNA, WVARF and the Governor's Committee, all work well together in order to put out the best product. I think we are headed that way and I think we are doing that. We applaud you guys and your hard work and your effort and being diligent in making sure that CRPs are protected as well as the state agencies and tax payers.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ms. Sampson, what do you see coming down the pike so far as proposed cuts in the state budget?

Mr. Arrick, we haven't seen anything yet but we know it is coming. That is something that Mike could address better than me. I don't know of anything at this point.

Mr. Greene, the 7.5% cut that we took, other than that I haven't heard of any other guidance from Secretary Taylor or anyone else down the hallway of any further cuts. Yesterday we had our budget presentation at 3:00 p.m. with the State Senate and we go up and we basically sell ourselves and say what we are doing with the money and those types of things and that went very well. I guess we will have to wait and see what other agencies requests are because we don't know. We go up and sell for the Department of Administration and the Department (DOA) of Division of Highways (DOH) does the same and Department of Health & Human Resources (DHHR) also does the same, but we really don't know what other agencies are asking for. So if someone else's needs are more than our needs we could get cut more than 7.5%. They could cut us again because someone else may need more money for a particular program. None of that has been brought to our attention. We probably won't know that until close to the end of the session.

Mr. Greene, we appreciate you all and we appreciate you allowing us to dive into your agenda and now we are going to dive right back out of it. Mr. Monterosso are you going to show us a video?

Mr. Monterosso, yes and Huntington Bank will be in shortly so we have some time for the video.

MOTION #10

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DATES FOR 2013

April 17, 2013

May 15, 2013

June 19, 2013

July 17, 2013

August 21, 2013

September 18, 2013

October 16, 2013

November 20, 2013

December 18, 2013