

MEETING MINUTES

October 16, 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. October 16, 2013 at the WVARF office located at 400 Allen Drive, Charleston, West Virginia.

ATTENDANCE: Cedric Greene, (Chairperson); William "Bill" Monterosso, Executive Director; Carol Jarrett, Recording Secretary.

ABSENT: Everette Sullivan
Phillip Mason
Gary Wolfe

WVARF Staff: William "Bill" Monterosso
Aaron Jones
Mark Jackson
Gary Wolfe

Attended by Conference Call: Brenda Bates
Jan Smith

Guests: Dave Williams, WV State Auditor's Office
Dawn Warfield, WV State Auditor's Office
Jack Holcomb, Precision Services
Steve Smith, Precision Services

COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT:

Mr. Greene, we have a quorum and we have had a roll call. Welcome to all guests. We are going to change our protocol today unless someone on the Committee would have a problem with it. We do have guests who are here under new business and we are going to move new business to the very front of the agenda so that Ms. Warfield and Mr. Williams can make their presentation. Precision Services is also here to talk about what they are talking about, correct? Brenda or Jan, do either of you have a concern with that?

NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Williams, the State Auditor's office is working to undertake a back file scanning of land documents and projects. These documents reside in our warehouse in Malden, West Virginia. We solicited some quotations for these services from a number of vendors and it is our belief that the WVARF contract is not competitive. I have with me some documentation today but I think before I get into that I really don't feel comfortable sharing the other vendors' quotes with Precision Services sitting at the table. There is not a question that it is our belief that Precision can do the work, the problem is with the pricing and we are here to talk with the Committee

about the pricing. I do not think it is ethical for me to be sharing other vendors' pricing with the vendor. I would like to suggest that Precision Services leave the room as I go through our logic and reasoning for making this request.

Mr. Monterosso, can I make a comment Cedric?

Mr. Greene, Brenda and Jan, do you have any concerns or any comments in regards to what Mr. Williams is stating.

Ms. Bates, we have been through this at times before, it is a public meeting and if there are issues that need to be discussed otherwise then it would have to go into Executive Session and everyone would have to leave other than the Committee members because it is a public meeting.

Mr. Williams, I think State Purchasing would think this would be the proper thing to do.

Mr. Greene, I'm with you Brenda, I believe it is a public meeting and whatever you bring you bring openly and if not we can go into Executive Session which I don't have a problem with doing that. I think that is fair and I can see their concerns. If the information he is getting ready to provide is not out on the website or if you can't go to the Auditor's office and request it or if you can't go to Purchasing and request it, then I think it is probably best that it be protected. Jan, do you have any comment?

Ms. Smith, I would think it would be something that was covered by FOIA because we have to be transparent with our prices and I don't understand why another vendor wouldn't have to be.

Mr. Greene, I think it has more to do with the process that the Auditor's office has gone through, whether it is an RFP or RFQ that they have not disclosed the pricings yet, am I correct.

Mr. Williams, we haven't done an RFQ, the only thing we have done is we have solicited quotations and I just do not feel that it is right to be sharing that with another vendor. If all the vendors were here I think it would be fine but to have one vendor who is on this document here and the others are not, I don't think it is ethical.

Ms. Bates, I don't know what the answer is because I think in the end because State Use is a set aside program, they will have to have the opportunity to understand what the differences are and the Committee can't just arbitrarily make decisions without input from Purchasing and giving WVARF because it is on the SWC the opportunity, they are the ones that have to give the waiver so they are going to have information anyway. I don't think it necessarily has to be in a public forum but it is going to have to be out there for WVARF at some point.

Mr. Greene, I think Mr. Williams's concern is that we are in the first phase of three phases and it is in the early stages and I think he perceives that it gives an unfair advantage to whomever to disclose.

Ms. Smith, does Jack mind leaving the meeting?

Ms. Bates, we can't do that, we have to go into Executive Session.

Mr. Greene, no it is not an option, we have to go into Executive Session and do we have a motion to go into Executive Session and we will after Mr. Monterosso speaks.

Mr. Monterosso, 2007 there was an initial request from the Auditor's office for a waiver to image the land books, that request was denied back in 2007 and then it kind of died. In 2013 I was approached by Dave Tinchler who made me aware of the request from the Auditor's office. Had a positive meeting with Mr. Williams on August 20th and my concern then is my same concern now and I shared Dave's commitment on being a good steward to taxpayers and looking out for the best value and cost to taxpayers. I am sensitive to that and I respect that. My concern is that I wanted to make sure that we are comparing apples to apples and that the requirement of the vendors' in addition to Precision Services were on an equal platform. If the cost came out to be the cost that it was comparing apples to apples, and I have had this discussion with Precision, if the cost is in fact that much higher doing the same exact service and I shared this with Dave as well, that I wouldn't have a problem giving a waiver, but I wanted to make sure that it was apples to apples. Now Dave wouldn't share that information with me out of respect to the other vendors' and I respect that. I did not feel comfortable just issuing a waiver which could potentially set a precedent for other vendors. If a particular vendor is doing business with the Auditor's office that Precision Services has had interactions with in the past and has had to come from behind and clean, I wanted to make sure; a) the Auditor's office was protected, and b) that they were going to get the best service possible and Precision Services was not gouging. The documents back in 2007, there was a request for 3,420,000 documents/land books to be imaged. Ironically, six years later 3,420,000 books are to be imaged, maybe there are no new books or land contracts that has been generated since 2013 and I don't believe that is the case. Maybe they just froze those books and just want that image. The big difference between 2007 and 2013 was in 2007 Precision didn't have the capability that they have now of doing it on site. They prefer to do it on their site, matter-of-fact, they have done between 6M and 7M imaging records just for vital statistics which those are a lot more sensitive, birth certificates are a lot more sensitive than land books that I can go into any County Courthouse and look at, so that is truly a public record. I wanted to make sure that if we are comparing apples to apples, everyone was getting a fair shake and not from just WVARF's perspective – it was exactly from WVARF's perspective because my perspective isn't 100% for the CRPs, it is the CRPs and the state agencies. I am a broker between the two to make sure that they are getting the best bang for their buck and everything is above board and fair. If Precision has the opportunity to do on their site that cost would go way down. I don't feel uncomfortable, I'll leave, we can go into Executive Session, but I don't think the Committee will have the documents in front of them to make an informed decision.

Mr. Greene, we are not making a decision.

Mr. Monterosso, right and without Precision here, so my recommendation Dave would be that you don't have to share the price.

Mr. Williams, that is the whole basis for being here.

Ms. Warfield, we have quotes from everyone including you guys.

Mr. Monterosso, I'm not worried about the quote, I'm worried about apples to apples.

Ms. Warfield, they are all exactly the same standard.

Mr. Williams, it is apples to apples, we have our own imaging system which is the reason that the same amount of documents are still sitting there six (6) years later. We have been imaging the newer ones, so the volume hasn't changed. It is apples to apples, we understand imaging, we do it ourselves every day. There was only one feature that Precision offers that the other vendors' haven't and that is the blind indexing. We used to do that ourselves but we don't really see a benefit in that other than it is adding a cost to the process, it requires another body.

Mr. Monterosso, it improves your accuracy almost 100%.

Mr. Williams, we used to do it I said but we found that it was negligible and we have enough indexes that if someone missed an index there is another index that you can look for that document by. So, I don't really see the value in it and as far as the rest of it, it is all saying the same, it is scanning, indexing, creating an image.

Mr. Greene, this is what we are going to do. If I get a motion we will go into Executive Session, we will allow the Auditor's office to do their presentation and they can talk about money and it won't be recorded. Do your presentations and do your financials and we will have everyone come back in and we will have a motion to come out of Executive Session and we will have you do an overview minus the financial piece. Does that make sense?

Mr. Williams, that is fine.

Mr. Greene, that way you all will feel comfortable and then Precision will speak on what they want to speak about. But I do agree with Ms. Bates and Mr. Monterosso that at some point and I think you will have to agree, in order to make a fair assessment the money piece has to come into play but really the burden is on the Auditor's office and the responsibility is on the Committee to see whether or not it is truly apples to apples. Do I have a motion to go into Executive Session?

MOTION #1

Ms. Bates, I move we go into Executive Session. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion passed.

Mr. Greene, we are now out of Executive Session. No decisions were made while in Executive Session.

Ms. Warfield and Mr. Williams presented their request/concerns, their viewpoint as they see it and so now what we will do is let Mr. Williams conclude with his presentation which will be about a minute.

Mr. Williams, as I have told you folks before your price was a lot higher than the other vendors who I had gotten quotations from. Since the time I spoke with you folks I have gotten another quote so I have four (4) quotes counting yours. Two of the four are what I would call substantially less. One is 54% of your bid and the others are 44% of your bid. However, I didn't take it at the total bottom line, I thought to be fair with you guys I should take a look at it based upon the second page that I asked you to complete which was basically providing a price per page, times the quantity of small documents, times the quantity of large documents. Again, you came out more than all three of the other vendors. I thought, let me take a look at the volume and you guys have the lowest estimated volumes of any of the other vendors and I don't

know why that is. To try to give some consideration to that and what I did was, I built another table looking at the lowest submitted estimate for small documents and the lowest volume for large documents and used your price per page and you guys were the lowest on the large documents and someone else was on the small. The point of it is when I did that you were still higher than anyone else on my spreadsheet. I also took a look at the maximums and signed you guys the maximums for whoever had the maximum for the small documents and whoever had the highest number for the large documents, I even did that times your rate and you were still the highest. I don't know why you are the highest, I had asked you before about would you take the blind indexing out and you said no, I think it was you Steve as you didn't want to take away from the quality of the work. I don't know what it is but it is my belief having two bids that are centrally half of your bid and there are probably others out there if I were to do an RFQ that would also fall in that range and there may be some as high as you or higher. My point is, I can't justify in my mind to my boss or the taxpayer paying twice for what I can get in the open market and if this Committee decides to give us a waiver or make us exempt from the WVARF process then my thought is we are going to get a lot of bids that are going to be all over the board. I want you guys to bid but you are going to have to sharpen your pencil and figure it out because what you are giving me just won't fly.

Mr. Holcomb, I understand we are all taxpayers in this room and as a taxpayer I want the state to get the most for their money also. Again, I think it comes back to apples to apples, apples to oranges and I respect what you believe Mr. Williams, but we have been doing this for 14 years and the quality that we provide our customers, I don't see how these other companies are going in that low and giving you the quality that we are going to give you. I don't want to jeopardize what we do for state agencies if we went in low and have you upset with us because we are not giving you the quality that you are expecting from us. One angry customer can ruin our business. We want to give you the best product for the price we can do it for. We don't feel like we are price gouging the state, like I said we have been doing this for 14 years and we know what our costs are.

Mr. Monterosso, one of the things that Precision came back with in terms of not only satisfying your need but building some additional sustainability for Precision is investing with their own money into a new scanner, it is a \$120,000 machine that would not be absorbed into the new contract. What I am saying is the Auditor's office wouldn't be paying for a new scanner. By them doing that it would improve some things and it would reduce their cost by about \$220,000. They would invest \$120,000 of their own money and at the same time reduce their contract by \$220,000. Now if you are really concerned about the quality but also about saving dollars, if purchasing a new scanner plus the ability if Precision could do it on site it would save you over \$300,000.

Mr. Williams, we talked about that before, we will not let them go off site, we have had that discussion.

Mr. Greene, this is the question I have and Brenda and Jan may have a question as well. Can you tell me when it was requested to back the blind indexing back out of it? Is there any reason why you all did do that?

Mr. Holcomb, the reason we did the double blind entries, if you sit there and type eight (8) hours a day you are going to make mistakes, people aren't machines. That is why we did the double blind. Even if we removed the double blind, it is only going to knock about \$40,000 off the contract.

Mr. Greene, the second question is with the work being done on site, how would you meet the 75% requirement of having employees with disabilities working, would they physically show up at the Auditor's office or how is that relationship.

Mr. Holcomb, if we would do on site at their facility we would probably hire some individuals through Goodwill Industries Work Program, we already have one lady that is interested. You said you would give us two work stations but possibly three, correct?

Mr. Williams, it would be two.

Mr. Holcomb, so we would only need two workers at their facility. In the contract they said we could do the indexing part of the contract back at our facility, correct, so that we could use workers at our facility for that portion of the job.

Mr. Greene, why do you think that potentially or possibly, now that I have seen it, factually that you all are 50% higher than other contractors, why do you think that is? Do you think it is technology, staffing levels?

Mr. Holcomb, it could possibly be part technology and like I said if we purchased equipment that Bill was speaking about that could speed things up a little but the books they have are oversized documents and they are fragile as they go back to about 1927. That is something you can't put through a high speed scanner the older documents are delicate and it is going to be a slower process of scanning those images.

Mr. Williams, everyone would have that same issue.

Mr. Holcomb, I am not questioning what you believe. For that price I don't think they are going to go and check those images the way we would check them to make sure that the quality – I know in the contract it says you want 100% accuracy. To sit there and scan eight hours a day someone may miss scanning a side, once these documents are scanned by us we go back and visually check those page-by-page to make sure everything is there – image cleanup if any black edge to the document we crop that off, d-skew it, they want optical character recognition for the documents so we have to make sure the documents are d-skewed before you run that OCR program or they are going to have issues with that down the road.

Mr. Greene, Jan do you or Brenda have any questions?

Ms. Smith, no I don't.

Ms. Bates, I don't.

Mr. Greene, so what are you requesting?

Ms. Warfield, we are requesting a recommendation from the Committee that the State Auditor's office be granted an exemption by the Purchasing Director from the State Use Contract for this project and that we be allowed to bid it out competitively pursuant to the statute.

Mr. Greene, you are not requesting a waiver from WVARF?

Ms. Warfield, no, we are requesting an exemption be granted under the statute that I gave you, 5A-3a-6.

Ms. Smith, would Precision be given an opportunity to bid?

Mr. Williams, we would love for them to and we hope they win.

Ms. Warfield, 5A-3a-6 Subsection C, asking the recommendation of the Committee to the Purchasing Director that we be granted an exemption from the State Use statute for this contract.

Mr. Greene, no one is going to be privy to the pricing that you gave to the Committee today. Not the other contractors?

Ms. Warfield, no.

Mr. Williams, I haven't shared anything with anyone other than Purchasing. I know that Mr. Monterosso was copied on one or two emails that came out of Purchasing and I don't know if any of the attachments revealed that pricing. I don't look at you as being the vendor but I guess you are – I look at these guys as being the vendor.

Mr. Monterosso, there was no pricing. The contracts with WVARF and we subbed it out to organizations such as in this case Precision.

Mr. Greene, but no one has this information and that is the intent is to keep it fair.

Ms. Warfield, so the competitors don't know what you have given us either.

Mr. Greene, is there a motion?

Ms. Bates, I need more time to look at it, I am looking at the statute, etc., I just need more time to think about it before I can make a decision and I really appreciate both parties taking the time to bring it to our attention as I think it is something we definitely need to look at. I just don't like to make quick decisions on things like that without looking at everything, that is my position on it.

Ms. Smith, I'm really not comfortable at this point making that decision either.

Mr. Greene, do both of you have the information that you need to arrive at something and when I get back I will send to the Secretary of State's office a ten (10) day notice or maybe a special.

Ms. Warfield, you don't need a 10 day notice, it is only 5 days now I think.

Ms. Smith, the second document that was sent to us, I'm unable to open it, the one that says ATT001.

Mr. Greene, you shouldn't open that one. They won't let you open that one. You have everything that I was provided. I will allow you all to go down that road of being informed and getting together then I will send you all a notice of the date and time that we will meet. I don't envision it being Thanksgiving. I see us meeting telephonically here in the next 10 – 15 days or so.

Ms. Smith, will you send this information to Everette also, please.

Mr. Greene, I certainly will.

Ms. Warfield, you could just call a special meeting for one purpose then it wouldn't have to be a full blown long drawn out.

Mr. Greene, we do appreciate it Ms. Warfield and Mr. Williams.

Ms. Bates, I do have one question for Mr. Williams. When you got this information did you include quality in your quote?

Mr. Williams, we talked about the quality in the document, probably had more to do with the fact that we wanted a quality job but in addition we expect the vendor to have either weekly or by-weekly meetings for us to evaluate the quality and if it is not a quality job our intention would be to throw the vendor out and find another one.

Ms. Bates, that is all I had

Ms. Warfield, I don't think we went into as much detail as they did, I think it was sufficient to address our concern.

Mr. Greene, thank you both

Ms. Warfield, thank you for giving us the time.

Mr. Greene, has everyone had an opportunity to look at the minutes from September and if so, do we have a motion?

Ms. Smith, I just have one spelling comment which is listed on page 2, Nicholas County is moving towards the intergraded, it is actually integrated.

Ms. Bates, on page 4 where talked about presenting the report and the last thing it says it is DRS responsibility and I think we ended up being DOA. I think we ended up with Cedric agreeing with me, I just want to make sure that we are clear in the end, but I thought we ended up with DOA. I just want to make sure it gets presented and the right person has it.

Mr. Greene, I don't think there is a change in the minutes, I think we just need to clarify whose responsibility it is. I will take it for action Brenda and thank you for bringing it up because we do need to know if it is DRS responsibility or a DOA responsibility to present to the legislature.

Mr. Monterosso, page 1 in attendance it had Everette and Phillip Mason and Don Arrick and neither of them were here.

Ms. Bates, that is where she is listing all the members of the Committee.

Mr. Greene, if you would from now on just put attendance and whoever is actually here then on the next line put absent, then put the Phillip Mason, Everette Sullivan.....

MOTION #2

Ms. Smith, if no other discussions or corrections I move the minutes be approved. Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.

Mr. Greene, the status of the Executive Secretary is that Don Arrick has moved on to another position and Mr. Tincher has that for action to name someone to be the Executive Secretary and the intention is for them to be here in November.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT:

\$5,055.00 -	Annual Allocation
0.00 -	A/P Personal Expenses (Act. 001)
0.00 -	A/P Employee Benefits (Act. 010)
315.90-	Total Disbursements (Act. 130)
<u>7.00 -</u>	Transfer Out
\$4,732.10 -	Balance Remaining

Mr. Greene, I sent a letter to Secretary Bowling September 6th regarding \$30,997.66 that was owed from 2012 and payment was made later that month. Just so you know I did the letter on behalf of the Committee and they did make payment.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Mr. Monterosso, next month we will be presenting the janitorial contracts as they expire December 31st. For July 1 of this fiscal year the Governor's Committee extended a request to extend the janitorial contracts as well as the commodity contracts through December 31st. There were a lot of reasons for that back then and one of them being the Affordable Health Care Act and the background checks, etc. and we still don't have a clear answer for the AHCA. We will be bringing forth the contracts in November to at least get the approval for the janitorial and commodity contracts then if there would be any questions or changes that need to be made we will have a whole month and typically we don't have, what I have been told there is not a Governor's Committee meeting in December, is that correct?

Mr. Greene, that is not correct?

Ms. Bates, yes we meet in December.

Ms. Smith, I heard you guys had good food back in December.

Mr. Monterosso, yes that is right, so we will have December to do that. I just wanted to put that on your radar because the end of this month I will need some help with some clarification as the temp contract expires 10/31/13. We are kind of in a holding pattern right now because Purchasing talked with Mike Sheets and talked with a couple of individuals within Purchasing and they aren't sure and I don't know if you have heard anything Cedric about what they are doing with the temp contract because they said they were going to put it out for bid and the reason they were going to do that was because of the Affordable Health Care Act and background checks and we haven't received anything from Purchasing yet as it relates to those temp contracts. We are moving forward to put those contracts in place but we are at a standstill as it relates to what Purchasing is actually going to be doing. This is the 16th and you would

think they would have given us something and released those contracts if they were going to put them on the street by now.

One of the things I want to make the Governor's Committee aware of and I appreciate the Governor's Committee taking the time today not just for the opportunity for the Auditor's office to come today but really looking at both sides of the equation and trying to make the best informed decision as possible. My only concern was that I don't want to set a precedent and in fact if the cost is that much higher, then whatever the Governor's Committee chooses or wishes I will respect and support that. We have a similar issue that is coming up.

As you know we provide bottled water and we have a company now that has penetrated West Virginia and they have an office setup in Huntington and Charleston called Water Source. What they are doing is penetrating state agencies and Mildred-Bateman State Hospital has already discontinued water which will eventually put people out of work at Green Acres because they went to his filtering system. I can't fault any state agency for trying to reduce costs or be more efficient. Lillian James who also distributes water for us was down in the southern part of the state with DHHR who had a filtering system and last month their filtering system broke down and it is going to cost over \$60,000 to repair and she is bound by that contract but she is begging to be able to get bottled water. I don't know what I am asking you if I am asking you anything, I just want you to be aware that Water Source is trying to sell the state agencies this filtering system and some of the feedback that I am getting from the customers is that Water Source is saying bottled water is staying at Green Acres warehouse for over a year, the longest timeframe is I'll say one week, I'll say seven days but Green Acres will tell you three days and that is the longest. As soon as it is manufactured it is gone, matter-of-fact they are having a hard time keeping up with production so it is not lying around the warehouse. I just wanted to make you aware of that in case this gets much larger and we are having state agencies to bypass the state use process to go with a filtering system. You can't fault state agencies for trying to reduce cost but at the same time it isn't a reduced cost if the cost is significantly higher than the bottled water. You guys have any comments/questions for me as it relates to that.

Mr. Greene, a gentleman from Water Source actually came to our office, the Cabinet Secretary's office on two occasions selling this same product unknown to me and once I figured out what the guy was doing I automatically shut it down. He is a salesman and he goes door-to-door and he is clearly trying to do business with the state agencies I do know that. I shut it down in our office, and then I saw him literally going door-to-door a day later. It is a real issue and concern with what he is doing.

Mr. Monterosso, would it be appropriate or would you feel comfortable on behalf of the administration to submit a letter to the state agencies requesting that the water contract is under the state use legislation.

Mr. Greene, I don't have a problem doing that. Brenda and Jan do you have any take on that one way or the other?

Ms. Smith, no not really

Ms. Bates, not really

Mr. Monterosso, I wanted to make the Committee aware that one of the things I will be doing is engaging in the services of a gentleman named Bill Luke. Bill Luke was Beckley, Region 1, I think 13 counties as it relates to the Workforce Investment Act. He was a wood Director there he retired from Region 1 and worked directly under the President of New River to build capacity, strategic development, etc. I will be contracting with Bill Luke to do a similar process with us to look at our current standard operating procedures, develop policies, help me develop procedures, organizational structure, board development, strategic planning for state use programs, business planning for state use programs with the CRPs, strategic board development and trying to get all parties working in unison as opposed to I guess I should say having all parties involved to understanding what their rolls are. He will be a good asset to us as far as continuing to build our foundation to making sure that WVARF's board members are trying to remove as much conflict as possible and at the same time developing some strategies to move us forward. I wanted to make you guys aware of that.

I have a question as it pertains to our annual report. We submitted our annual report that had two fiscal years attached. Now we are just about done, correct Aaron with our last audit? The annual report is due in January. Would it be ok if instead of submitting what we got approved last month the annual report, the Auditor's office has said that they should get it done mid-November but we could try to push them a little to see if they could get it done before the Governor's Committee. Would it make more sense that in January we combine all three years that way we have the most current and fresh information rather than submitting what we have now and then right behind it submit another annual report for this past fiscal year.

Mr. Greene, if it is going to be a completed product and we can do it by December 19th Committee meeting, that is fine with me. Jan or Brenda do you have any concerns about that?

Ms. Smith, as long as there is an explanation that they know why they are getting three years' worth which you know turnover in the office, I would be fine with it. I think they should have the most up-to-date information.

Ms. Bates, I'm fine with that.

Mr. Monterosso, as we talked before the meeting, when we do these renewals if we could just talk off line Cedric just so it reduces the burden on you as opposed to the fair market letters and all that. We need to kind of plan something as it relates to the renewals of these contracts.

Mr. Greene, is there a lot of them to sign?

Mr. Monterosso, it is all our contracts, all of the renewals and the fair market letters that go with all those and what will happen at the next month's meeting we will present just like historically has been done and here is Department of DHHR, total amount and we will have all those separate contracts so DHHR will be approved one swoop and fair market price attached and all that. But those fair market value letters have to be attached for each one of those. It is fairly substantial. That is why I wanted to do it in November that way we are not spending December when people go on vacation and we get hammered.

CONTRACT PRESENTATIONS:

Mr. Jackson, the first two on your list are change orders:

- 1) WV Department of Education Warehouse. The reason they are reducing the service, I guess there was somebody in the building that was using the restroom and evidently they moved on and there is not as much activity at that warehouse so they are requesting from twice a month to once a month cleaning that building. That pretty much cut the contract in half.
- 2) Bureau of Senior Services. They are located upstairs of the Charleston Town Center Mall. They have added an additional 1226 sq. ft. to the contract. That would be a total increase of \$545.97 for the remaining of the year. That was approved by both CRP and the state agency.
- 3) Camp Dawson – (New Contract) I put an explanation with the packet to explain what happened and Mr. Greene you might expand on it a little more as I'm not sure what happened behind the scenes.

Mr. Greene, I have no idea, I saw this in an email but I have no idea what they are talking about. How would I know about this?

Mr. Jackson, someone from the Department of Armory was supposed...

Mr. Greene, Maj. Hodge?

Mr. Jackson, I don't know if it was Maj. Hodge or his supervisor was supposed to get with you. It supposedly happened back around the 27th of September.

Mr. Greene, what supposedly happened?

Mr. Jackson, Camp Dawson had called and wanted us to come up and they needed the contract to – they wanted to add the Op Center to the Fitness Center and back in June we had approved to do the Fitness Center before and it went to the Governor's Committee. We gave them the contract, they never did return it signed and in the meantime from what I understand another vendor had come in and was doing some cleaning there and they may have billed the Camp Dawson and I guess they were shocked at what they had been billed and they said to get WVARF in. I got that call on a Tuesday and I was within an hour from being at Camp Dawson and I went directly there and I went with Sgt. Grimm and John Hyre of Preston County Sheltered Workshop and we added the Operation Center to the Fitness Center. We had previously gotten that approved by the Governor's Committee but it never went any further, so it was really a dead contract. They needed numbers quickly and I was getting them numbers on Friday and told them I couldn't get it approved until our meeting today and I told them unless someone there talks with Mr. Greene to see how we could expedite the contract as I guess they had to appropriate the funds and I was told by Major Hodge that his Superior knows and works with Mr. Greene, and he will talk with him to see how to expedite the contract. I have an email that has his signature on it and I thought it had your signature on it as well although not legible.

Mr. Greene, I can tell you this, the long and short of it, I have never heard of Major Hodge, I don't know what this is about. What is the bottom line?

Mr. Jackson, the bottom line I was just bringing this contract to the Board to go ahead and make it retroactive to October 1st.

Mr. Greene, are you all already up there doing the work?

Mr. Jackson, yes

Mr. Greene, you are doing that off what authority, that this guy says he knows me or says I am involved in this somehow, right?

Mr. Jackson, I think it is good faith - Preston County Sheltered Workshop understands they are trying to help out Camp Dawson.

Mr. Monterosso, it was a request by the state agency saying we need you in here. The timing is such that we are here October 16th and if the Governor's Committee approves it from today forward then John Hyre understands he is out two weeks and if we approve back to October 1st and understanding that Preston County was operating under good faith at the request of Camp Dawson, so be it.

Mr. Greene, Brenda or Jan do you have any questions or concerns about this one?

Ms. Smith, no I think it sets an expansion of services that would be all right.

Ms. Bates, is Preston County already at Camp Dawson?

Mr. Jackson, yes

Ms. Bates, so they are expanding what they are doing?

Mr. Jackson, correct

Ms. Bates, they are the current vendor at Camp Dawson and they are just adding space?

Mr. Jackson, that is correct.

Ms. Bates, I think it is ok but the process in terms of how you handled it wasn't good. You shouldn't start working until the approvals are done and you could have done that very easily by letting Cedric know like we always have that in an email that it is something that is urgent and we need the vote of the Committee. Bill has been there when we have done that in the past and that is how it should have been handled.

Mr. Greene, I don't know who this Maj. Hodge is and I definitely don't know who he is talking about when he is talking about his superiors. No one else could have had an opportunity to do this work, right?

Mr. Jackson, correct.

Mr. Greene, when this type of dialogue takes place again just pick up the phone and call me as I don't know about these guys. They clearly must know me, you or Bill could have called me and say here is the deal so I will know and we will be good. The next one.....

- 5) Mr. Jackson, the last one is the DHHR in Doddridge County. It is a brand new building, new contract. We sent out an RFI and only one CRP showed an interest. The contract period October 21st through December 31st. A total price of \$2,306.55 for the period.

Mr. Greene, is there a motion to accept the contracts that has been presented before us.

- 4) Mr. Jackson, this is one that has already been approved by the Governor's Committee. We do not know where the signed copy is but we believe it is with Camp Dawson but we just needed you to sign it.

Mr. Greene, it has already been before the Committee?

Mr. Jackson, yes

Mr. Greene, no problem

Mr. Greene, is there a motion to accept 1, 2 3 and 5

MOTION #3

Jan, so moved, Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

Mr. Jones, I have prepared the financial statements for the end of August. I made one change in the Statement of Activities; I thought this might help you in looking at it to do a comparison of where we are at the end of the year. The first column is the Actual and the second column is the Actual for those two months and also I have the Actual for the year still as we had it. So you can see our income is 103.8% over the first two month period.

Our expenses are 99.75% (Administrative costs). The other expenses for the CRPs are 103.6%. The net change in Assets is \$8,563.30 for this period of time. Payables, basically everything over 60 days is paid. There were a couple of items paid after 8/31 but they have been paid. As Cedric mentioned earlier in our receivables we did receive the payment from DHHR on the Diamond Building and we appreciate the letter and help in getting that. The last page on receivables shows total receivables as of 8/31/13 was \$2,789,149.72. We have received payments after that for over 60 and \$47,387.96 and over 90 at \$32,857.20. Does anyone have any questions? You might take a note on page 2 of the Statement of Financial Position, on Long Term debt we did have to tap into our line of credit for \$250,000.00 and again in September we have also tapped into it for \$200,000.00 but both of those amounts have been paid off as of September 30th. Those were just where we were receiving our funds a little slower from the agencies, but those have been paid back.

Ms. Smith, the financial statements are so much more readable and able to understand now than they were in the past. Thank you Aaron.

Mr. Greene, Brenda do you have any comments or questions?

Ms. Bates, no

Mr. Greene, is there a motion to accept the Financial Report.

MOTION #4

Ms. Smith made a motion to accept the Financial Report. Ms. Bates seconded. Motion passed.

Mr. Jones, can I say something on the Annual Report? In the past it appears that they have presented three previous years. What we were looking at doing on this report is using the two years we just gave you plus the current year so it would be labeled as the 2013 fiscal year but it would also include those other two years as the historical years going forth. I don't know if that makes a difference in how we present it or not.

Mr. Greene, because the other option is to put 2011, 2012 and 2013 on the front of it, right?

Mr. Jones, right

Mr. Greene, Brenda or Jan do you have a preference?

Ms. Smith, to be honest with you, I think it would be less confusing to the recipients if it just said 2013 and the other years also in there.

Mr. Monterosso, and look like it is showing a three year comparison.

Ms. Bates, I'm fine with it.

Mr. Greene, I think it is cleaner.

Ms. Smith, the volumes of paperwork they receive they are not going to notice.

Mr. Greene, they will only notice if on the front of it. It is not going to change it; they will just have to collate the item to read it.

Mr. Greene, is there a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Monterosso, last month we talked about going to Greene Acres and I thought we did everything but agree upon it for this month that is why I sent that email yesterday because it wasn't in the minutes so I knew everyone was coming here. Do we want to meet there next month or do we want to meet here again next month.

Mr. Greene, Brenda or Jan do either of you have a preference, here or Green Acres?

Ms. Smith, I would like to go to Greene Acres at some point.

Mr. Greene, does November allow you to do that?

Ms. Smith, I should be able to come then, yes.

Ms. Bates, I'm on jury duty that week so it is whatever you all need to do. Hopefully I will be able to be here but I may or may not. Depends upon if I get picked, my luck I'll get picked.

Mr. Greene, I'll tell you what we will do, if everybody could put it in their planning that January we will go to Green Acres, we'll start the year off with Green Acres. January's meeting will be at Green Acres.

Mr. Greene, thank you both Jan and Brenda, I certainly do appreciate it and if you could the item that was tabled if you could just get smart on it and get to wherever you have to get to on it then I will notify the Secretary of State's office of our intent to hold another public meeting here in the coming days. I will wait for feedback from you Brenda and Jan.

Mr. Greene, have a good day and thank you.....

OLD BUSINESS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

COMMITTEE MEETING DATES FOR 2013

November 20, 2013
December 18, 2013