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**Friday, September 22nd, 2023**

**10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**

OREGON COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND

• Any agenda item may become an action item.

• Any of these items may be a conflict of interest.

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER- Chairman Hauth.
   1. Roll call.
   2. BE Director Recruitment Update and Discussion—Dacia Johnson and Sherry Lauer
2. NOMINATIONS
   1. Salem 1- currently held by Art Stevenson. Managers in area: Harold Young and Salvador Barraza.
   2. Portland 1- currently held by Steve Jackson. Managers in area: Celyn Brown.
   3. Outlying area- currently held by Carole Weber. Managers in area: Steve Gordon and Robert Lewark.

Elections will be held at our Fall In-service, Saturday, Nov. 4, 2023.

1. NEW NEW BUSINESS
   1. Rules & Regs, active participation
2. OTHER

ADJOURNMENT

**Transcript**

Wolff: Looks like all.

Hauth: Alright, we'll call the meeting to order. And we'll start by roll. Do we have Art Stevenson on the line?

A Stevenson: I'm here.

Hauth: Good morning, Art. How about Lewanda Miranda?

A Stevenson: Good morning.

Hauth: Lewanda? Okay, Carole Kinney?

Webber: Here.

Hawkins: Webber.

Hauth: Hey, Carole, good morning. Oh, yeah, okay, sorry. Yeah.

Webber: That's okay.

Hauth: Good morning.

Hawkins: I get it.

Hauth: Hey, Steve Jackson, yeah, Steve Jackson? Okay, Derrick Stevenson?

D Stevenson: Here.

Hauth: Okay, and I am here, as well. And I'll go ahead, after I finish roll, I'll go ahead and reach out to Lewanda. Has anybody heard from Lewanda this morning?

Hawkins: No, I hope everything's okay.

Hauth: Okay, I'll reach out to her, yeah. Okay, and I do hear Char on the line. Good morning, Char.

Brown: Celyn is here, as well.

Hawkins: Good morning, Randy.

Hauth: Hi, Celyn. Good morning.

Brown: Good morning.

Hauth: And any, any other vendors, any other vending managers on the line? Okay, and I take it we have Michael Wolff, Dacia Johnson, and Sherry, I'm sorry, I do not recall your last name.

Lauer: Lauer.

Hauth: Lauer. Okay, good morning, good morning, good morning. Anybody else on the line that’d like to acknowledge, be recognized? Okay. Hearing none, I am going to turn the meeting over to. Go ahead, who is this?

Miranda: Lewanda's here.

Hauth: Okay. Oh, Lewanda, hey, good morning. Good morning.

Wolff: Hi, Lewanda.

Hauth: That'll save me from trying to get ahold of you. Yeah. Okay, well I'm going...

Miranda: I'm traveling.

Hauth: Okay, I'm going to turn the meeting over to Michael, Dacia, and Sherry. So, the floor is yours.

Unidentified: Can hear you [inaudible].

Johnson: Thank you. Mr. Chair. Good morning, Elected Committee members and also the vending facility managers that have joined. Obviously, this is a big topic today. So, we are here to receive your input, active participation, on the recruitment process and plan for the Business Enterprise Program director position. We have not done this since 2012 and kind of looking back on how we did that previously, the Elected Committee had input into the questions for the earlier rounds of interviews and then there was, in the final stage, a kind of a public forum that involved the finalists in which the Elected Committee and other folks, we held a public meeting so, other interested parties and vending facility managers participated in that process. So, you will see from the draft recruitment plan that the Chief Human Resource Office, HR manager, Sherry Lauer has put together in draft form for your review is we're proposing a higher level of involvement this time. And she is using a template that has been successful in recruiting for other types of executive management positions throughout state government in which there's a need and important element of stakeholder involvement such as this. So. The first thing that we were hoping to do is walk through the duties and responsibilities in the position description and make sure that we've captured all of the elements to that. You will see from content, there is a lot of elements in the position description. Some of it is enterprise wide. Expectations for all managers within state government in the executive branch. Some of it is agency-wide and it's standardized across all positions. So, really the, the, the core elements that we are hoping that, that you've attended to and have input for us is around those specific duties and responsibilities. So, we'll do that first. Sherry will get input into the position description. And then we'll shift to the recruitment plan itself, which is that lengthy document that kind of maps out from start of posting the position through job offer. A plan that we would carry out over the course of several weeks.

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair.

Hauth: Yes, Art?

A Stevenson: Okay. Yeah, I would, you know, I examined the documents and everything, and, and so, at this point in time, I would like to make a motion. The federal law says that the Elected Committee shall actively participate in major administrative program, policy, and development decision making that affect the overall administration of the program. Obviously, the hiring of a director is a major administrative decision. And therefore, I would like to make a motion that the Elected Committee be allowed to participate in each step of this process because I believe that only having one or two, unless the individual people on the Elected Committee does not want to participate, that we cannot, cannot discriminate, we must allow all the members of the Elected Committee to participate in this process. And so, I make that motion that anywhere in the process, that the Elected Committee as a whole actively participate as required by the federal law.

Hauth: Art, prior to your motion, let me… Well, I'll go ahead and hear your motion and then I do have a question to clarify with Dacia. So, a motion's been made. Do we have a second on the motion?

D Stevenson: I second.

Hauth: Okay, second's been made. Open for discussion. So, Dacia, Sherry, so, you know, I did read through, like Dacia said, the lengthy document and some of it was hitting home and some of it was relevant and some of it was, you know, a little bit confusing to me or not necessarily as important as other items. You mentioned at the beginning of the meeting that the process involved would be the same as last time where the Elected Committee does have a vote or a voice in recommending. I know the Elected Committee is not the hiring authority, so, you know, that recommendation can be accepted or not, but is it still the intention to have the Elected Committee weigh in and vote on or recommend the person that they would choose to hire? And the reason I ask that, when I went through and tried to understand the timelines and the different stakeholders at the table, which I think is all great, right? More involvement of the stakeholders and Committee members or vendors is all great, but at the end of the day, like Art did mention, this is a little bit different because a major administrative decision such as this does have to be weighed in by the Committee. So, with that long question to you, hopefully you've been able to think through a response. So, anyway, so, if you, if you would please.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I, one of the things I think it would be helpful is if, if you would allow Sherry to walk through the information. I think we will get there, but I think it's important that we make sure that we're hitting all the elements. This right now is part of the active participation. So, I want to make sure we're not skipping something. But if you, the final stage prior to job offer is that public forum that would be that facilitation I think that you're talking about in the recruitment plan. But we are also suggesting that there could be a member of the Committee on the earlier stages to inform the full recruitment process before that stage. So, I think it would be helpful if we allow Sherry to kind of walk through, and first of all, start with the PD, but also g--, go through the recruitment plan itself.

Hauth: Okay. Thank you very much. Art, do you have a, do you have a concern with that or what is your specific concern?

A Stevenson: Well.

Hauth: It does look like, it does look like the agency is asking to include at the earlier stage like a member of the Committee or the, you know, but anyway, go ahead and clarify if you would, please.

A Stevenson: Well. Thank you, Mr. Chair, I will. Obviously, the federal law does say that the Elected Committee shall actively participate. It doesn't say one individual or two individuals and so, the federal law obviously dictates that. And furthermore, obviously the state statutes clearly states that any laws, rules, or policies must ensure the proper and satisfactory operation of the vending facility and for the benefit of the blind licensed managers. The Elected Committee does represent the blind licensed managers, and therefore, through this whole process, they should be allowed, you know, not only to participate, if they so desire, but the law actually dictates it. And so, we must ensure that we're adhering to the law. But we also must allow the Elected Committee who represent all the managers, be able to weigh in completely during this process and so, I believe the federal law and the state law requires that, that we participate totally just not parch--, partially if that is what each member of the Elected Committee wants to do and feels that it is their obligation to do so.

Johnson: If I may, Mr. Chair?

Hauth: Okay, so, any? Yes, please.

Johnson: I'm reading the section out of the rule. And what the active participation section speaks to is, and I'm getting to the specific section. And it relates to staff. Development of selection criteria for Business Enterprise Program staff recruitment. That is the specific language out of the rule itself.

A Stevenson: Well, that's it, and so, that clearly says to me that we establish the criteria.

Johnson: Correct.

A Stevenson: Which means that if we want to participate, we all want to participate, then that is how the process should proceed and so, in all actuality, I mean obviously, the Elected Committee can, each member of the Elected Committee could, could say whether they want to participate or not. But they should be allowed to do so, if that, they feel it's their obligation under the law and the rule that you just stated, Director Johnson.

Wolff: And Mr. Chair, I just want to, I want to point out that, Sherry has had her hand raised. So, she might have something to say, too.

Hauth: Sure, sure. Yeah, and I've, I’ve called in, so I'm not able to view that, but Sherry, yeah, please feel free to just, you know, unmute yourself and ask for the floor when you need to. So, go ahead, Sherry.

Lauer: Thank you. Good morning, Committee and BE managers. And something that I do need to stress, because you are an Elected Committee, if the Elected Committee participates in every aspect, the process will need to significantly change to adhere to public meeting law. And we could not all be in a room interviewing the candidates. Every person on the Elected Committee, we'd have to change, shift how the interviews are done, because it, we would have to follow public meeting law in order for everyone to participate. And so, I just did want to share that it would shift the entire recruitment plan, and the timing, and everything would have to be publicly noticed. I want to share that candidates are not comfortable doing interviews in public meeting until the final stage. They don't, often times candidates are employed, and they haven't disclosed to their employer that they're interviewing. So, they won’t, they don't, we don't typically release all the details until a final stakeholder meeting where we've gotten permission to also release their names. So, it's typically intentional that the final interview or final public forum is where everybody gets a part, a chance to participate. But also, we have to remember that it's a very competitive market. You're not just interviewing candidates, they're interviewing us, and they're interviewing you. So, we also need to be respectful of what candi--, candidates are expecting. And candidates will not, most candidates will not proceed with public meetings until the final stages of an interview process as a final candidate. So, that could create a little bit of a risk of having candidates that would be willing to participate in a completely public process.

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair?

Hauth: Hold on just a second, are there? Yes, go ahead.

A Stevenson: Okay.

Hauth: And then, I want to hear from the other Committee and, then we'll, we'll move on either with the vote or not. So.

A Stevenson: I can, I can say we obviously can go into executive session if an individual feels uncomfortable with that. We could definitely address that issue and do it in executive session. Which is completely legal under open meeting laws and therefore, we would be able to mitigate what you just said, described.

Lauer: That's, this is Sherry Lauer.

Hauth: Okay. Let me, let me, let me add.

Lauer: Can I please add…

Hauth: Go ahead, Sherry, sure.

Lauer: That actually, that actually is not the case. Because when you notice public meeting, you're giving the names at that time, and you have to notice executive session. So, we have to give public notice for both the meeting and executive session. So, their names and resumes would be released as part of that notice. Executive session just allows you to deliberate and have private interviews. But it doesn't, it still requires us to release all the information in advance, which is the primary issue. People don't want that information out until the final stage, knowing that they're a finalist for a position.

Hauth: Thank you, Sherry. I'd like to hear from Lewanda and Carole. You know, bot--, really, I support what Art's saying. However, I do think it, dravs [sic] another layer to this that may slow down the process and not necessarily yield the end result that we're looking for, as well. Personally, I don't have the time or interest to be involved in every step of the way. I totally support the public forum and the vote and recommendation of the Committee. However, you know, if, you know, if Lewanda and Carole and Derrick and Steve all want to be part of that process, then I'd like to hear from them. And if not, then, you know, Art, we can either vote on it or you can reconsider or whatever. But, Lewanda, Carole, Steve?

Miranda: Yeah, this is Lewanda. I don't feel comfortable voting on this right now. I'd, I’d like to hear the rest of this process and personally, I don't think that we have to be involved in every part of all of it, and I certainly don't want to be breaking any meeting laws.

Hauth: Carole?

Webber: Yes. Excuse me, I apologize. Got a cold. I don't feel it's necessary for me to go through every step of the process. However, you know, I don't want to vote on anything. I have read the information that was sent. And it is lengthy, as was said. So, you know, I think personally that the process that they're talking about actually is really good. And, but, as for myself, I don't want in every step of the process.

Hauth: Okay. Steve? Thank you, Carole. Steve? Steve's not on here. Derrick?

D Stevenson: Yeah, I don't, I don’t have anything to say or add.

Hauth: Okay, okay, Art, you want to, we can move forward with the motion on a vote if you'd like. I know there'd been a motion and a second a made, so.

A Stevenson: Yeah, Randy, I, I do want to make that motion and then we obviously are a federal program. And so, perhaps we could get somebody that is a legal mind and has expertise and get them to weigh on it. However, you know, I do believe that each individual man, person on the Elected Committee should be allowed to participate in all or part of, whichever they desire to, so I want to continue the motion. And then we can, we can check on the federal.

Hauth: Okay, Art, I'm going to go ahead and call the question.

A Stevenson: We can check on the federal aspects of that because we are a federal program.

Hauth: Yeah. I'll call the question. A motion's been made, a second. Art? Yea or nay?

A Stevenson: Yea. Yea.

Hauth: Derrick? Yea or nay?

D Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Lewanda, yea or nay?

Miranda: No.

Hauth: Carole, yea or nay?

Webber: No.

Hauth: And I'll vote no, as well. I support what Art is suggesting and saying, and if we need to address this differently. However, I believe at this time, it's not necessary, with all due respect to Vice Chair Stevenson. So, let's go ahead and move this forward, please.

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair?

Hauth: Yes?

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair?

Hauth: Yes, Art?

A Stevenson: Just so you know, I am going to go and seek clarification. I don't think that we have the right to vote no if, you know, the elected person of the Elected Committee wants to participate. And obviously, you know, the, the members of the Elected Committee hasn't had time to discuss that with managers that they represent and so, they obviously should get their input. Because perhaps the people they represent want them to participate. And therefore, you know, they should consider that before they cast it, cast a no vote. So, I'm, I’m going to put that on the record and then we can move forward. But.

Hauth: Sure.

A Stevenson: You, I think...

Hauth: And I, I, I would, I would just, just say, in respect of our guests here, both Executive Director Johnson and Sherry. I think we're making a lot more of this than needs to be. However, you know, no disrespect to you intended, Art. I totally support what you're trying to get at. I just think we need to move forward with this and our guests at this point in time. Thank you.

A Stevenson: That's, that's fine, we can.

Unidentifiable: I think that he’s done a double. [inaudible]

Hauth: Go ahead. Dacia, please, if you would.

Johnson: Alright, thank you, Mr. Chair. If I may, I will start with the, just making sure that you've reviewed and feel good with the content of the duties and responsibilities outlined in the position description which will be linked in the actual announcement itself. So, Sherry will be, you know, capturing your thoughts, remarks, suggestions for the position description itself. And then we'll move on to the recruitment plan. So. Any feedback on the position description?

A Stevenson: I think that it would be very important to make sure that any past experience in management, or food service, or all that other stuff should be included to make sure that we get a total picture of the individual, of education, past experiences in the different aspect of being a BE Director and so, I don't know if that was planned, but it wasn't included. And so, I have a question about that, whether it should be more descriptive on the duties and responsibilities that the candidate will have to do and, and, you know, what kind of education or past work experience those individuals have had?

Johnson: So, Art, if I may, I think that's good feedback. I think that is for the position announcement itself. So, I just want to make sure before we get into the announcement and the recruitment process, that we're really just talking about the duties and responsibilities of kind of the day-to-day work of the Business Enterprise Program Director. Any feedback that you have on what's reflected in that position announcement, or position description that you received? Any feedback in the position description? I know there, this is something that you have had seen in the past, the Committee had seen, and it's not changed probably substantively since your last review, so it's possible you don't have additional changes to recommend, I, perhaps?

Lauer: This is Sherry, I would like to add that the classification for this director position is considered a Business Operation Supervisor II. The classification is determined by the state and not necessarily by the agency itself. The minimum requirements for this classification that the state requires is a minimum of four years of lead work, supervision, or progressively related experience or one year of that experience and a bachelor's degree. So, anybody who meets those minimum qualifications of the classification can be considered as an applicant. So, I just want to point out that the classification itself has minimum requirements. We aren't able to have additional minimum requirements. We can have desired attributes, where we might lean towards someone who has certain skills, but we can't add an actual requirement. I just wanted to make sure that the Committee knew what the requirements of this position were, was. Thank you.

Johnson: Thank you, Sherry. So, not hearing any feedback on the position description, Mr. Chair, with your permission, we'll move forward with the recruitment plan feedback.

A Stevenson: Say that again.

Johnson: If there is no feedback on the position description in terms of the duties and responsibilities of the Business Enterprise Program Director, we can shift to getting your feedback on the recruitment plan, which I think gets to some of the, the, the questions that you were raising, Art. Alright, hearing nothing...

A Stevenson: Okay, I just, I, I just want to say you know, that I'm, I’m definitely going to be sharing this information with, you know, this is definitely a federal program. Yes, it's a state program because of the mini Randolph Sheppard act, but again, because it is a federal, federal program with the enhancement of the mini Randolph Sheppard Act, I just want to clarify from more experts, if we could require more since, obviously, the Commission is a licensed, is licensed through the federal government and therefore, you know, I understand the part about the minimum requirements on the state level. But I want to, I just want to find out if we can also, because this is a federal program, if we may be able to have additional requirements. So, I just wanted to state that, and, and when I do my investigating and talking to more experts on, you know, the federal level of it, then I may have some further things to bring forward.

Hauth: Thank you, Art. And, Dacia, yes, I could not get off mute, so, I am off mute now and let's go, let's go ahead and proceed, and you know, just like Art, I want this process to go properly and at the, you know, at the end of the day, the best, brightest person possible in that position. And I don't know how that will look, but I'm willing to support and move forward at this point in time, thank you.

Johnson: Alright, thank you, Mr. Chair. So, I'm going to ask Sherry Lauer to walk through. So, you received two versions of the recruitment plan. One in a table format which is a little challenging to navigate with a screen reader. And so, we also did just a simple Word document that took out all the format out of it. Which as many of you have already pointed out, it is lengthy in nature. It is a plan, and it is intended to be carried out in detail. So, we are trying to cover all of the elements and stages, and so we can know what we're doing at each step. So, I will turn it over to Sherry. She will walk through each of the sections to obtain your input. I will call your attention to, an example of areas where we could really use your expertise is around how to get the word out. So, calling your attention to that recruitment announcement process. And where you may have your own rich network of professionals to get to that best of the brightest as we all want to apply, that you're able to help get the word out and, and tell us where we should be posting and, and trying to get folks involved. So, with that, I will turn it over to Sherry and I appreciate your input.

Lauer: Thank you, Dacia. Thank you, Committee. I do want to walk you through the recruitment plan, and I want to again point out the shift. So, back in, I believe, 2000 and 12, when this last position was last filled, the Committee was able to provide input into the interview questions. And then their second opportunity for input was the public forum for a stakeholder meeting where the Elected Committee could ask questions and provide input into the candidates. So, there were really two areas that the Elected Committee had input during the last recruitment. What I've attempted to do was increase the involvement of the Elected Committee during this recruitment while also ensuring that we are adhering to public meeting law. Part of my job as an HR manager with the state, I support eight different state agencies and I also do executive recruitment for executive directors, for people like Dacia. I'm currently working on the Board of Pharmacy executive director. This is the recruitment plan format that we follow for all senior level positions and executive director roles. So, this, these plans are designed specifically for boards, commissions, and Elected Committees, where we have to abide by public meeting law. So, this plan was designed with public meeting law in mind to be able to maximize participation. So, instead of just having input into the interview questions, like back in 2000 and 12, I'm, I’m going to jump, I'm going to jump to the steps after the posting and I'll go back to the posting. After, we're recommending that the position is posted for a 30-day period to get an ample applicant pool for this position. We typically, for higher level positions, do at least 30 days. As I mentioned earlier, it's an extremely competitive market. Even when we get down to final three candidates, we are still struggling. So, we want to have as many applicants and as many candidates in the final stage as possible, because of the recruitment challenges. After the posting is done, the CHR recruiter, so, one of, a member of our team would be assigned as the recruiter. I'm supporting it from an HR manager perspective. Once the minimum requirements and desired attributes are identified, the recruiter would review all applicants that come in and for the minimum requirements, they would ensure those applicants met the minimum requirements and if someone didn't or they didn't complete the application process correctly, they would be rejected and would not move forward. So, in the first step, the recruiter is reviewing for minimum qualifications. That's standard for all recruitments across the state. Then we take the candidates that are left who have met the minimum qualifications and desired attributes, and our recommendation is that we have a small screening committee that, and this did not exist in the past, HR did this entirely last time. The BE Committee was not involved in the review of the applicants. The applicant name and personal information would be redacted, that would be considered confidential. We would not be able to share that information. It's protected until the final stages of an interview. But participants in the application review process, my recommendation is one BE Elected Committee member and a BE manager, somebody who isn't part of the Committee. Identified agency leadership. A BE staff member and then I would participate from an HR perspective. And the, this group would identify which candidates would move forward to the first interview. As I said, back in 2000 and 12, HR did all of these steps in the past, and the BE team wasn't involved in the prescreening. So, we are recommending an additional opportunity for the BE group to participate, have active participation. The next step we're recommending is first round interviews. We are using a tool called Vidcruiter, which is a video system where we are having first round, primarily most first round interviews are done by Vidrecruiter, where we submit questions to the recruiter and the recruiter creates a recording that we send to invited candidates to participate. Those candidates would record their answers and the individuals that would be part of that first round selection committee would be scoring the recorded interviews. It would not be live. It, our recommendation for the first-round interviews is having a BE Elected Committee member, a BE manager, agency staff and leadership, and somebody from HR. Back in 2000 and 12, the BE group was not part of first round interviews. So, this is an additional opportunity for active participation that didn't happen previously. After first round interviews, we would begin the reference check process in preparation for second rounds. The participants in the first round based on the scoring, the top candidates would move forward to the second round. We're recommending that the second-round interview, because of oftentimes the disbursement, disbursement of candidates geographically, that we do a live Zoom interview for the second round. Again, the recommendation is that there's one BE Elected Committee member, some, a manager who's not elected, agency leadership and staff, and HR. We recommend an average of five to seven people per panel, and we always recommend an odd number because that assists when you are scoring in potential tie breakers. So, we never recommend an even number on an interview panel for that purpose. After the second-round interview, candidates that would move forward would do a Business Enterprise meet and greet. So, it would be a public forum where we would ask that questions be submitted in advance to HR. We have to make sure they're legally sound and that we can ask them in a recruitment process. Our recruiter or myself, we would facilitate the stakeholder session and any questions that the BE Committee or BE manager submitted in advance or any other stakeholder, we would ask those questions on behalf of the Elected Committee. After that public forum you would have a survey where you have an opportunity to provide input into that electronic survey, from that public forum. And that would be the entire Elected Committee. It could also include all of the managers and any other stakeholder that the Elected Committee felt was appropriate to participate in that meet and greet session. The final interview and the input for the meet and greet would, we take the information from the meet and greet and use that information as part of the selection process in the final interview. So, the recommendation is that the final interview would be with a smaller group. Typically, the final interview is with a much smaller group. And then, the survey results would be submitted to that group, and a decision would be made after that final interview. So, it would be a three-step interview process that we're recommending. In the past, the BE Committee was not involved in any of the actual interviews. You were only involved in the stakeholder public forum and providing input. This recommendation is giving an opportunity for the Elected Committee to participate in every stage of the process. And last time there were only two pieces...

A Stevenson: Which we should.

Lauer: …providing interview question input and the public forums. So, this would open it up entirely to allow participation throughout.

Hauth: Hey, Sherry?

A Stevenson: Mist, miss, go ahead, Randy.

Hauth: Yeah, yeah, Sherry, this is Randy.

Lauer: Hi, Randy.

Hauth: Hi, hi, I have a question or two. I don't know if you want me to wait till you're

done or if I can ask those right now? But.

Lauer: Go right ahead, I'm happy to answer them.

Hauth: Okay. Sure, so a couple questions for you. What is the thought process behind having, well, first of all, let me say, thank you for the enhanced involvement and participation of expanding the opportunities that did not exist before, but do now. And why it might not be a hundred percent, you know, you know, why we might not be a hundred percent in favor of it, as was expressed earlier. I do appreciate at least that growth in that area, but question for you, what's the thought process behind having a board member and a vendor instead of two board members? Am I missing something there?

Lauer: It's actually related to public meeting law and if you create a potential quorum with participants on a panel, it could create a risk for the recruitment process because we have to abide by public meeting laws since you are an Elected Committee. And that actually helps us, it, when you have somebody who's not on the Committee. At least you're getting two participants in a BE program, but then we're not also having to do a public meeting notice and do it under public meeting law. That, that's entirely why.

Hauth: Okay. But would two, would two board members constitute a quorum because there's six members on the Elected Committee. So, that's what I was trying to grapple with. How that is decided or what the process is, because everything I'm understanding that two members would not make a quorum and would only be relative to, like, if, if rules or regulations or a decision was being discussed, but... I mean, correct me if I'm wrong, but that's kind of how I'm understanding it.

Johnson: So, Randy, there...

Lauer: So, all of the ins...

Johnson: I'm sorry, I just want to clarify.

Lauer: DOJ has advice. Oh, sorry, Dacia, go ahead.

Johnson: So, so, if, so, Randy, are you, are you feeling, is, is what you're hoping to accomplish there is to have more Committee involvement? Is there some concern with allowing the other folks from the program to participate as well or? What are your thoughts? I'm just curious.

Hauth: Well, I guess, guess, I guess my question that I asked earlier was what are you [sic] guys thoughts, right? So, I don't think it's fair to turn it back on me and say what are my thoughts when I'm saying, you know, you guys have established this process. And you're saying only one board member and one vendor. So, I'm wondering, I'm wondering why? I mean, I believe two board members should be participatory in that, and I don't think it constitutes a quorum and the board members do represent the vendors. So, I'm just trying to get inside your mind and understand why that was developed.

Johnson: Well, I think it's a draft. So, if, if the Elected Committee, two members would not constitute a public meeting. We would have to be careful that you're not engaging in dialogue with other folks. So, is, it the more folks you get involved I think there is that thing where you talk to a third person at which point you have created a public meeting. So, this would mitigate the risk completely. So, I, I do think that there are folks that are on the line that are not members of the Committee that, that may be of, interested in participating in the panel. But if there are certain sections that you think that should be exclusively Committee, then we could certainly look at that through that lens.

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair.

Hauth: Oh, yes, go ahead, Art.

A Stevenson: Yeah, well, I just wanted to comment, okay, on the fact that there are… First of all, I'm a blind licensed manager who just happens to be a member of the Elected Committee. And I would most definitely want to see individuals sitting on any panel to, you know, that their knowledge and expertise, you know, be available to ask questions and, and those kind of things, as a blind licensed manager. So, you know, what I would like to see is the individuals sitting on this panel, you know, some of the criteria be, you know, education maybe, being involved for many, many, many, many, many years versus only a couple of years and, and could not, you know… So, my opinion is, that we should select the two individuals as managers and, you know, their qualifications, their knowledge, their expertise, perhaps even their education would be helpful. And so, I would like to see, you know, the two candidates be on knowledge and expertise, not just as, as a manager be the criteria, because obviously, you know, some individuals could actually look at scenarios or ask questions because of either their education or, you know, the length of time that they've been involved in the BE program. Obviously, they've experienced a lot more than a manager that may have been in the program for only a couple of years. So, I don't think it should be based, I, I think it should be based on managers and not, you know, whether they're a member of the Elected Committee or not a member. Because like I said, I'm, I’m a blind licensed manager who happens to be on the Elected Committee but should not be excluded, just because I happen to be on the Elected Committee. I want individuals who have the, more experience on all of the stuff so that, you know, appropriate questions could be asked and all that kind of stuff. And like you said, two does not constitute a quorum. So, I don't see any problem with, you know, picking, picking individuals on experiences and education and all those kind of good things. Because obviously, you know, I've been in the program for a long, long, long, long time. And perhaps would be more qualified to ask pertinent questions where a manager who has far less experience wouldn't be able to do it and the ultimate goal here is to pick the brains of these individuals. And, you know, sure, it's kind of a judgment call, but it's also because you've met tons of directors and all those kind of things and you would catch nuances that other people would not. So, anyways, I'm done with that one.

Johnson: Others?

Hauth: Anyone else have a question or comment? Before we move on? Go ahead, Sherry. Thank you.

Lauer: Thank you. Dacia mentioned earlier one of the biggest pieces where we will need assistance is helping ensure that we cast a wide enough net, that we have a strong applicant pool. And so really looking at where, whether that's paid advertising, or associations where we should be reaching out. In general, when positions are posted on the state, they are automatically picked up by several websites. So, most job search engines will automatically have this. Indeed.com, most everything that's out there. So, the posting will be accessible for folks that do job searches. But really what the most effective recruiting is where we're really reaching out to associations, organizations, something else we will do with this posting is once we do have all the desired attributes and requirements, we have a way to look at everybody who's ever applied for a state position. And we will send them the posting, as well. So, we have things that we will do to try to generate an applicant pool, but this is a fairly specialized program and there might be organizations or associations whether that's in vending or restaurant management or those types of things. But we would look to the Committee and other managers for suggestions of where you would like to see advertising or effort in getting this posting out. And so, we really look to you to help provide us some input and guidance in that area. Suggestions?

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair.

Hauth: Yes, Art?

A Stevenson: Okay. Well, first of all, I'd like to state that we most definitely should notify the two advocacy organizations that are put together for blind people, namely the ACB and the NFB. And you know, obviously, any state that has a program, a vending program should be notified about it. It's also in my opinion, maybe posting it across the country on Newsline which, you know, a lot of people have access to it and in fact, I think they have a job opportunity thing on their, which, you know, blind people read and stuff like that. But those, those are the three suggestions or was it, yeah, I think I was three. But anyways, those particular organization and maybe also NCSAB, Dacia's quite familiar with them. Reaching out to that particular organization may also be helpful because they actually have a Randolph Sheppard Committee. And so, I think that would most definitely do a wide posting for the position that is open. Opening up.

Lauer: Thank you. I’m taking those notes. And the Newsline, do you mean the NFB Newsline?

A Stevenson: Yes.

Lauer: Okay thank you.

A Stevenson: That's, that's nationwide. And so, actually the Commission for the Blind is also sponsor of that in the state and stuff. And so, you know, having that posted in one way or the other. And I know the Commission has a, a place where they post their stuff, and stuff, too. But I think, you know, nationwide, it could easily be posted on all of, of them basically, by contacting I think the NFB is the one that oversees it nationally.

Lauer: Any other suggestions?

Hauth: Hey, Sherry, this is Randy. I do have a question. I don't know if you can answer it or not, but I know you mentioned a couple of times is basically an employee market driven right now. We're lucky to get anybody, basically. But what do you expect on a position like this within 30 day? Do you have any kind of data on expected applicant pool or any such thing?

Lauer: I wish I did. Unfortunately, I can tell you the trends that we're seeing as applicants [inaudible] in science, science related fields are very, very high. Applicant pools in this type of position and similar are much smaller right now. And we're seeing an average of about 10 where we used to see in over 30 applicants to start. And so, it, it could, and 10 applicants typically would net maybe one finalist, and we don't want to be to one finalist. We are finding that we oftentimes are making an offer to the second or third candidate at times. Keep in mind, where we, while we are very competitive in total compensation and benefits, the private sector is really pushing a lot of incentives and things like that and salary competitiveness, and so, we are challenged with just the salaries in some of our positions as well. And that we, we can't do anything about, our salary ranges are our salary ranges. And so, this, this isn't going to be an easy position to fill in this market. We have had situations in other positions where we've had three failed recruitments and we've gone through this three times and have not been successful. I just am being transparent about what the reality of the labor market is. It would not surprise me if we were unsuccessful the first time because we are having to go out multiple times for a lot of different positions right now.

Hauth: Well, thank you, I…

A Stevenson: Sherry? Hey, Randy?

Hauth: That helps. Yes, go ahead.

A Stevenson: Randy?

Hauth: Yes?

A Stevenson: I, I thought of another suggestion where we might advertise it. And that would be with NAMA, who actually knows the vending program. In fact, you know, one of our blind licensed manager [sic] actually sits on the NAMA board and stuff. So, advertising it through NAMA might also be a good way to do it because well, as you know, Randy, when we go to NAMA, you know, there are several blind people there and stuff like that. And they're quite aware of the vending program. And obviously, if individuals live in a state that has a friendlier climate than Oregon, might just like to relocate. So. Sorry, Sherry, but there's another aspect of where you could advertise that, but more, more places, the better chances we have for recruiting somebody.

Lauer: Absolutely, we appreciate it. This is exactly what we need. The, the more the merrier. If, if you have suggestions that you think of afterwards, please send me an email, because I will be adding these and working with the recruiter when we get to that point. It's very helpful. Thank you.

Johnson: And Art, what does NAMA stand for?

A Stevenson: National Association of Merchandising. Don't quote me on this. I'm trying to remember.

Hauth: National, National Automated Merchandising Association.

A Stevenson: There you go. Thanks, Randy.

Hauth: Yeah, yeah, I'm reading it off the list here.

Johnson: Thank you.

A Stevenson: Oh, I got one more suggestion. What about colleges? You know, where somebody's majoring, you know, that's just a thought that popped in my head. You know, letting colleges, the know, because they're always looking for possible jobs with people who either have, you know, are working on getting a business degree or close to it or a past student that they might be able to recommend or at least communicate them to their, that's, that there's a job opportunity out there, kind of in relation to their field of expertise. Which, you know, I'm, I'm looking at business, but that may be a possibility, too, advertising through colleges or, you know, they always actually, actually work hard at finding jobs for individuals who are graduating, are close to graduation. Or, you know, might be interested in the position.

Lauer: Thank you.

A Stevenson: Just a thought.

Lauer: Noted. Absolutely.

Hauth: I might have missed it or forgotten it, but does it identify, or do you have the information of what the starting base salary is on this?

Lauer: Let me get that. I just had it open. Give me one second, I knew I was going to be asked this.

Hauth: As I recall, it was rather, as I recall it was rather low. I know that there was opportunities, you know, to, you know, progress and move up through the salary structure, but...

Johnson: Sherry, it might be helpful for the Elected Committee to understand how the pay equity happens, as well, if, if Mr. Chair would field that.

Lauer: Yes. Absolutely. Give me one second, I want to make sure I have the right…

A Stevenson: Now doesn't it…? You can correct me if I'm wrong, but can it not be, you know, salary begins with, you know, experience obviously, if somebody who has more experience and stuff like that, can they do that, Sherry? I mean, obviously, to entice somebody who is making a certain amount of money but doesn't want to give up that money, but if the job started at a wage because they always already have a lot of experience in working in the particular field. Could it actually be started higher, based on experience and stuff? To entice those who might take it if they have more work experience and wouldn't take a cut in pay?

Lauer: I'm happy to answer that question. So, the state of Oregon has the pay equity law that all employers are required to use. And what that means, when, and we are prepared to make an offer, we're actually required to do what's called a pay equity analysis. And when someone submits their application, they're submitting all of their education, their credentials, their work history, really all of their background. What we can't ask for is, we can't ask people what they make, and we can't ask them for pay stubs. It's unlawful for us to do that under the pay equity law. What we do is every person that's employed with the state, all of their information is in a system. So, how much they make, how long they've been with the state, what their credentials are, what their education is, what their professional background is, both in the state or prior to the state. And we enter all of the information for the applicant we are making an offer to, and we're actually given a salary that we can offer that's based on being equitable to all other people in a similar position in the state. And so, theoretically, someone with more experience and more credentials would potentially be offered a higher salary. In the state, because the state is primarily a union and a seniority-based environment, seniority does play a role. And so, sometimes we actually request exceptions to the offer to be able to offer a higher salary, because sometimes seniority plays a higher role in pay equity in the state. But that is the process that is followed. The salary range when somebody starts, they're not immediately PERS eligible. So, the starting salary for this position, the entry is 5,079 and the top step is 7,861. It's rare that somebody starts at the top step in the state without having prior state experience. This, it's a salary range 28. Kind of everything in the state starts at like salary range 12 and goes up from there, but it's 5,079 on the low end and 7861 on the top end.

Johnson: And then when they become PERS...

Hauth: And is that, is that without benefits? That's without benefits, correct, Sherry?

Lauer: Correct. That's just salary.

Hauth: Okay. Okay, and what do they calculate benefits nowadays? Is it like 15% of the base salary or is that high or how does that work?

Lauer: It's actually much higher.

Hauth: Okay.

Lauer: And in fact, we have a calculator now. A benefit calculator that is available online that will take a salary and your combined benefits because it also depends… If, like, this position is an example, management positions accrue higher vacation accruals than non-management positions. So, some positions have a higher total compensation than others. I can follow up and kind of enter the math.

Hauth: Well, no, I was, I'm just curious. Yeah. Thank you so much.

Lauer: You're welcome.

Hauth: Go ahead, Dacia. I think you were trying to…

A Stevenson: So, I've got another...

Hauth: …Say something. I think Dacia was trying to say something. Go ahead, Dacia.

A Stevenson: Okay.

Hauth: And then go to Art.

Johnson: Yeah, and I think for the, once someone is eligible for the Public Employee Retirement System, then their income goes up I think by 6.95%. But that basically goes into your, PER, you know, minus the transactional elements, the point 95, the 6% actually, you don't take that money home it goes into your retirement account. So, the money does, there, it does go up once you’re PERS eligible, but it's not pocket cash, it's retirement earnings.

A Stevenson: I got a... Okay, that's good to know. Now, I got a, a question, because I hear about this all the time. The fact that a [sic] employee of the state has the opportunity to opt out of being part of the union and not have to therefore, taken out of their, their salary, union dues and stuff like that. Do these, are these individuals informed about that or is it, you know, is this explained to them when they become a part of the agency or anything, just out of curiosity, because obviously, if money isn't taken out and they're going to be able to keep more money, then that would be an enticing factor, I would think?

Lauer: This is not a represented position. This is a management position. So, it doesn't pay dues. It's not part of the union and it is advertised as a management position. So, they are no part of the union. So, they wouldn't have to opt out. It's considered a management position. So, it would be advertised with the higher-level benefits and vacation leave, as well.

A Stevenson: Okay. Thank you.

Lauer: You're welcome. Any other questions I can answer? Thank you for allowing me a chance to…

Hauth: What will the next step be? Sherry, what will the next step be?

Lauer: Ultimately, we need to get the final input for participation and on the panel and being, Dacia being ready to allow us to release it. So, we want to ensure we're getting appropriate feedback from this group so we can finalize our documents and partner with a recruiter to begin the posting process.

Hauth: Okay.

Lauer: So, really final input from this group.

Hauth: Okay, well with that, Dacia, one thing that just came up now, I know in the past, I believe, correct me if I'm wrong, but Director Morris as a BEP Director, he also did other agency work, I believe. I don't know how that plays into the job description, or the job announcement, or, or you know, with that, but if you could answer that, please. And also, what, like what Sherry just mentioned, what will be the next step that we or you have to allow for?

Johnson: Alright, sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, there is, when you are a member of a leadership team or a member of an employee of an organization, you, you know, at times, they're trying to support that organization. So, for example, someone goes out on vacation leave, we back each other up. Someone goes out on medical leave, we back each other up. In Michael Wolff's case, he can attest to, somebody, you know, leaves the agency, they step in into interim roles and take on additional duties and responsibilities. So, that part happens in any organization. We have regular leadership team meetings. Obviously, the Business Enterprise Program Director is critical member of my team. So, those types of duties and activities happen in any organization, and they certainly happen here. On the timeframe. What we want to make sure. I'm sorry, go ahead. Alright, I'll continue with the timeframe. In my brain, we want to make sure that the Committee feels comfortable with the plan that we've created. And ideally, we would be announcing and kind of posting the recruitment sooner rather than later. If we wait too much longer, I feel like we're going to hit up against holiday season, which is a challenging time for recruitment purposes. And I know that we want the best candidate, we also want to, to fill the position as soon as possible. So, for example, I would recommend that we try to target for a, for a posting of recruitment, assuming that you are amenable to Sherry's recommendation of that thirty-day timeframe, as soon as possible, maybe around the first part of October. And that means that we would want your feedback in terms of the posting, of the potential locations to recruit, and all of that stuff to, to happen in the next week or so. So, we can get this live and out on the streets, I would hope by October first. That is, you know, I'm open to feedback if, at that feels like too fast for the Committee.

Hauth: Well, with the challenges explained and shared, I think sooner is better. Obviously, we want to get it dialed in the best way possible. So, any Committee members, hopefully everybody's read over the material provided and if anybody has any further concerns or suggestions, let's, let's get them together here and get them to Dacia and, and Sherry, I believe it would be. And so, we can get this process going. So.

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair?

Hauth: Yes, Art?

A Stevenson: Yeah, I'm going to reach out to some other states and kinda get a feeling on their process. Especially, you know, since we are a federal program and all that kind of stuff and maybe get a little input and so, hopefully you can get that done quickly and get some weigh in. Most definitely want to talk to some people who are heavily involved and know about the program and collect their thoughts. Terry Smith comes to mind. And, and some other individuals, but once, once I get some clarification about the active participation part and all that kind of stuff then, you know, I would be able to, you know, make a final decision. I definitely want to make sure that, you know, all our rights and stuff, are looked at and adhered to.

Hauth: Alright, anybody else before Sherry and Dacia go on their merry way? Alright, not hearing any, thank you so much for joining us and we'll get that information to you as soon as possible, and I believe. And go from there.

Johnson: Alright, thank you, Mr. Chair, and just to reiterate, our plans will be to try to get that target of October 1st unless there's some major thing that is, that we haven't considered today. We do want to get it out before the holiday activities start to get, to increase latter part of the year. So. Unless we hear something otherwise that occurs after this public meeting, that will be our intent to use your feedback today to finalize the plan and get it out as soon as possible.

Hauth: Alright, thank you so much.

Johnson: Thank you so much for your time. Bye-bye.

Hauth: Bye, Sherry. Thank you.

Lauer: Bye-bye.

D Stevenson: Have a good day.

Hauth: Right on. All right, all right, all right. Okay, so, this, I'm not sure what time it is? Does anybody have the current time?

Wolff: About 11, 11:20, Mr. Chair.

Webber: 11:20.

Hauth: 11:20. Okay. So, what do we have to do? We, this meeting was basically called to finish up the meeting of a couple of weeks ago, and I know Vice Chair Stevenson had asked that we hold the meeting and address the, I believe the final agenda items and maybe some other business. I'm not sure, but let's go ahead and carry on into the rest of the agenda. So.

Webber: Okay. The first thing is nominations. Salem One.

Hauth: Alright, alright, alright.

Webber: Currently held by Arthur.

Hauth: Okay. Okay, so, hey, Carole, did we have, do we have public comment on there or do we have approval of minutes or no?

Webber: No, we do not.

Hauth: Okay. Okay, good enough. Not that we, not that we needed it, to do it this time, but, if everybody's okay, we'll move in, we'll move into nominations. We have nominations for Salem One position currently held by Art Stevenson. Do I have any nominations for that position?

A Stevenson: I would like to nominate Art Stevenson.

Hauth: Art, Art Stevenson has nominated himself and do we have any other nominations?

Unidentifiable: Nominee…

D Stevenson: Did you hear my nomination or?

Hauth: No, no we did not.

D Stevenson: Oh. Well, I was just going to nominate Art, but I had it on mute.

Hauth: Well, it, the business got done. Do we have any other nominations? Okay, hearing no further nominations, the nomination for Art Stevenson is closed for Salem One.

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair?

Hauth: Yes, Art?

A Stevenson: I move that we elect Art Stevenson by acclamation since there's no other people running for the position. There's no use, and that's completely legit under Robert’s Rules of Order and stuff to elect him by acclamation. And then we don't have to…

Hauth: And, so what would do…? So, would we take a motion on that?

A Stevenson: You would just say. Well.

Hauth: Okay, got it.

A Stevenson: Is there a second? You'd ask for is there a second?

Hauth: Okay, so Art is [sic] motioned that we accept Art by acclamation. Do I have a second on that?

Unidentifiable: I know how to do it.

Hauth: Do we have a second on that?

D Stevenson: I second it.

Hauth: I'll go ahead. Okay, second’s been made. Any discussion around that? Okay, yea or nay, Art?

Unidentifiable: When you're ready.

A Stevenson: Just, just say...

Unidentifiable: I'm not on mute.

A Stevenson: …All those in favor say aye. That would be appropriate.

Hauth: Well. Yeah, let me just do, Art.

A Stevenson: Okay. Yea. Yea.

Hauth: Yea or nay, Derrick?

D Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Lewanda?

Miranda: Yea.

Hauth: Carole?

Webber: Yea.

Hauth: And I'll vote yea, as well. Okay, motion passes. What do we have next, Carole?

A Stevenson: Oh. Mr. Mr. Chair?

Hauth: Oh, yes.

A Stevenson: In order to do everything to Hoyle, I would like to make a motion that we add, oh, jeez, what's his name? The new manager who just got Camp Rilea into Carole's, was it Carole's, yeah, into Carole's region.

Hauth: The outlying area?

A Stevenson: Yeah.

Hauth: Okay, motion's been made to add Robert Levick [sic] to the outlying area. Do I have a second on that?

Miranda: I second that.

Hauth: Okay, any discussion? Okay, yea or nay? Art?

A Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Derrick?

D Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Lewanda?

Miranda: Yea.

Hauth: Carole?

Webber: Yea.

Hauth: And I'll vote yea as well, motion passes, okay. Thank you. What do we have next, Carole?

Webber: We have Portland One currently held by Steve Jackson.

Hauth: Okay, Portland One position. Do I have any nominations for that?

A Stevenson: I nominate Steve Jackson for that position.

D Stevenson: I nominate…

Hauth: Okay, do I have any other nominations? Okay, do we have any other nominations? Do we have any other nominations?

A Stevenson: I move we close nominations. I move we close nominations and vote

Steve in by acclamation.

Hauth: Okay, do I have a second on that? I'll second it. Any discussion around that? Okay, hearing no discussion, we'll vote. Yea or nay, Art?

A Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Derrick?

D Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Lewanda?

Miranda: Yea.

Hauth: Carole?

Webber: Yea.

Hauth: And I'll vote yea, as well. Thank you. What do we have next, Carole?

Webber: Okay, it's the outlying area currently held by Carole Webber, myself.

Hauth: Okay. Do we have any nominations for that position?

Unidentifiable: What are we…

Miranda: I'll nominate Carole.

A Stevenson: I nominate Carole Webber. Oh, go ahead, Lewanda.

Unidentifiable: Nomina--, motion.

Miranda: I'll nominate Carole Webber.

Hauth: Okay. Nomination’s been made for Carole Webber. Do we have any other nominations? Do we have any other nominations? Do we have any other nominations?

A Stevenson: I move we close dominations and elect Carole Webber for that position by acclamation.

Hauth: Do I have a second?

D Stevenson: I second.

Hauth: Okay, any discussion? Alright, yea or nay? Art?

A Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Derrick?

D Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Lewanda?

Miranda: Yea.

Hauth: Carole?

Webber: Yea.

Hauth: Yeah, yea!

A Stevenson: Conflict of interest! Conflict of interest!

Hauth: And I'll vote yea, I'll vote, I'll vote yea as well. Okay, so, motion passes. What do we have next, Carole?

Webber: Okay, I have a new business. And it says, rules and regs, active participation.

Hauth: Okay, I know, I noticed on the agenda when I was looking over it this morning it had rules and regulations, active participation and I think there was other business, and I know in talking with board member prior to the meeting, there were some other items that maybe had arisen that maybe need discussed or maybe not, but. Let's go ahead and I'll turn this over to Art. I believe, Art, this was one of your items that you'd requested. So.

A Stevenson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all, I'd like to say that the rules and regulations currently enforced were unanimously rejected by the Elected Committee. And obviously, if they were unanimously rejected by this body then they've been deemed by the Elected Committee, who represent the managers in this program, to be in conflict with the law. Now, obviously, there's a portion of our state statutes that says any rules or regulations, and I'm paraphrasing here, in, in violation or in conflict of the law are null and void. And therefore, I would like to make a motion that under that law, the rules and regulations be declared null and void along with every aspect of it, because we do represent the managers and obviously, even the state statutes say that they must be beneficial to the blind licensed managers and since we have deemed them not beneficial to the blind licensed managers in accordance with our state statutes, any part of it should be --clared [sic], be declared null and void and the agency should in good faith finally sit down with the managers and write rules that we can all agree to. So, I'll make the motion, that we declare the rules and regulations null and void, because as we voted in the past, they are not beneficial to the blind licensed managers.

Hauth: Okay, motion's been made. Do I have a second?

D Stevenson: I second.

Hauth: Okay, second's been made. Any discussion around this? I'd like to make a comment on this. I mean, totally, I agree with Art that many of the rules are not a benefit to the managers, as well. They don't comply with the state statute, thus being a benefit to the managers. I also further believe that historically, most recently, the rules have been used as a [sic] anvil against the managers, they've been used as a weapon, they've been weaponized against the managers. So, instead of trying to benefit the program and the managers they've been used, in my opinion, by the administration in many ways to limit and deny opportunities for the managers. Case in point, how the time tracker has been utilized in Office of Administrative Hearings through the AG's office through Director Johnson to deny some basic rights to managers. And it's just been, you know, you'd have to read their findings and the rulings and the argument by the agency, but it's rather ridiculous. I do believe also it's time to sit down and talk with the agency. However, what I was, my dilemma is here is we've made motions, Art, probably you have made motions like this numerous times, right? And the agency continues to come back and say, oh no, they've been approved by RSA and you guys had active participation. So, you know, blah, blah, blah. So, I'm trying to grapple with what happens when this gets denied again. You know, do you have a strategy in place? Are you just simply trying to document it, because it's in my opinion, it does not assist us to just make motions and then have the agency deny it and us go on our merry way. So, before I vote, if you could...

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair?

Hauth: Yes, Art?

A Stevenson: Yeah, I'm ready, I'm ready to comment on that, Randy. Yeah, we established a new Committee in the last mitty [sic], meeting. It's called the Compliance Committee. And it is my intent to make sure that there is compliance. I've already reached out to people in the state legislation, made them aware of this and so, I'll just say that we have rights under the law. Those rights are supposed to be followed. We even got an active participation definition that we rejected and most of the country has a more agreed upon definition of what active participation. However, our agency rejected thit [sic] and wrote their own. And so, I can assure you, Mr. Chair, that the time has come for the agency to abide by the laws and the rules and regulations of our program and not just make up things, whenever the heck they want to. And I definitely plan to expose what's going on and I'm positive, because I've received positive response [sic] from individuals, a commitment, make sure that our program is run in accordance with the law and things are not just made up to convenient, to be a convenient for the agency and deny our managers their rights. So, rest assured.

Hauth: Alright, alright, was it, well.

A Stevenson: Okay, I'm done, Randy.

Hauth: Okay, thank you. Yep, I wanted to hear that. So, okay, any other comments before we move to a vote? Okay, hearing no other comments. Yea or nay, Art?

A Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Derrick?

D Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Derrick?

D Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Okay. Lewanda? Lewanda? Carole?

Webber: Yea.

Hauth: And I'll vote yea, as well. So, motion passes with the hope, desire, and belief that we can sit down at the table and use these rules with the agency and try and work through these rules to make it more palatable and benefit the vendors. So, thank you. Okay, what do we have, what do we have next?

Webber: It just says “other” on here.

Hauth: Okay, Art, you have, maybe this was you. I'm not sure, but.

A Stevenson: Well, we, we used to have “other” on there before. If something came up that, you know, a member of the Elected Committee or manager who is present would want addressed. And I, as a matter of fact definitely do have something to address. And that is the micro market situation. It definitely is a problem in this program, and it needs to be addressed. We need to get rid of any unviable micro market that a manager is not making any money at. And of course, you know, the agency, as I stated before, should embrace that because to ensure the proper and satisfactory operation of a vending facility, surely, surely. I mean, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to know that if a facility is not making a manager money and in fact, may be causing [sic] them money, that isn't proper and satisfactory because this program is supposed to enhance our ability to be able to make a living. And so, this issue definitely needs to be addressed. And the agency needs to comply with the law and not have a bunch of facilities in existence just for the convenience of a building that wants services.

Hauth: Alright.

A Stevenson: So, so, that definitely needs to be addressed. And the agency is most definitely, and it says so, make surveys. And create facilities that will properly and satisfactory operate. The time has come for the agency to proactively look for locations that's going to make a blind licensed manager money and eliminate the ones that are not making money. And that's what this program is all about. Now that deals with, you know, that actually deals with everything. We shouldn't be having nominal vending machines in locations that really aren't making any money. You know, it would be great and I'm all for a manager making money. But I'm not for, you know, going to a location and pulling out a bunch of product and either having to move it to another machine, because you have to make sure that it gets sold. So, we need to definitely adhere to the law, and we need the agency to proactively make sure that any facilities will properly and satisfactorily operate. That's one thing that I wanted to talk about. Does anybody want to comment on that? I mean, I, I, I want to make a motion [inaudible].

Hauth: Yeah, I, I have a comment, I have a comment, Art, so, I have a comment. So, when you talk about micro markets, clearly micro markets are not the, not the issue, it's micro markets that are in locations that are not profitable. I know the agency, you know, when I was talking to Intern [sic] Director Wolff, maybe a week or so ago, we, we discussed some issues and what I thought maybe was some of the concerns historically here in the program and why the vendors and agency were at divides many times. But one of the things I failed to or forgot to share, is the total lack of business savvy to this point that the agency embraces or has embraced. They didn't really necessarily even care when people shared concerns about the self-service initiative and how that would impact their finances. Basically, Director Johnson and Director Morris said, well, we don't care. It doesn't say you have to make any money in it. That's not what we're after. We're after the initiative and implementing it. I mean, how ridiculous is that? When they went to, I think Carole or Steve or Harold or whoever it would have been and said, we want to put a micro market in here because the building wants it and people may have shared that hey, look it, this is not going to be profitable. They said, tough, tough stuff. Do it anyway, right? So, when people have documented that people are stealing, like employees, stealing from them. And we need to find a way to address this and put cameras in or find other deterrents. Basically, nope, we can't do that. So, micro markets, I have several micro markets within my subcontracted vending facilities that do well. Micro markets can be and are in many parts of the state and country viable facilities. However, in talking with Lewanda yesterday, or the day before, I think we would all agree to this, that the agency historically has listened to building managers’ needs over the needs of a vending facility manager and that's got to stop. We've got to be more business-minded and people at the agency have to care about profitability and have to listen to the voice of the manager. So, I agree with you. Micro markets should not be shoved down somebody's throat because that building wants one. You know, so, those are my two and a half cents worth.

A Stevenson: That's cool.

Hauth: Anything else, Art?

A Stevenson: So. Well, I just want to make sure, okay, that we're a part of the vending facility process. As you know, Fort Rilea we found out about it after the fact. And of course, again, our knowledge and expertise was not available to make good decisions on how we would proceed with things. And, you know, so, clearly, we should be involved or at least have the opportunity provided to us to give input before, before contracts are signed. We, I mean, that used to happen, Randy. We actually discussed and, and you know it, you were a part of it. A facility on what kind of services we were going to provide for it. Etc., etc. Which we have to get back to that, because…

Hauth: Yeah, and I agree, I agree with you, maybe, maybe that will happen.

A Stevenson: Yes.

Hauth: Us just talking about it. I, I know we need...

A Stevenson: Nope we…

Hauth: …to put a plan together, right?

A Stevenson: Right.

Hauth: So, I, but I agree. I'd just like to say for the record. I'd like to say for the record, I believe that Camp Rilea was in motion prior to Interim Director Wolff. So, I do appreciate Interim Director Wolff at least scheduling a [sic] informational meeting. I think that was a step in the right direction, that actually never happened much in the last 12 years. So, I think that was a good step, but obviously, regardless of who's going to be in this position, I concur and agree with you 100%. We need to have a [sic] inclusive seat at the table and helping provide, you know, our knowledge base and information. So, you know, I agree with you, but let's, let's put a plan together and you know, maybe try and…

A Stevenson: Well, I want to, yeah, well, here, here's the thing, Randy. Okay. The agency is supposed to provide us with program relevant information. I mean, it's mandated by the law, but when it's done behind closed doors, okay, then it's a violation of the law. Obviously, Camp Rilea is program relevant information, which the agency should provide to us willingly because then the ideas or things that they may not have even thought of can be in, you know, introduced. And you know, I found out that they went and had a meeting with Camp Rilea and all BE staff, I believe it was, got to go to Camp Rilea and, and talk about Camp Rilea. But again, we didn't know what was happening until after the fact. I mean, it's, it's doggone ridiculous. And then, when you ask a person that participated a question and they just flat tell you, well, I'm not going to talk to you about that. That's a violation of the law when you, when any manager asks for program relevant information, it's a requirement for the agency to provide it to you. But. And, and I don't care if, you know, if you're only an interim director, the law specifically states it and then when you state the law, they, they don't talk to you anyway. They just say, well, I'm just not going to talk to you about it. So, I mean, that's wrong. It's against the law. And I'm, I'm, I’m tired of my rights, not only as a manager, but as a member of the Elected Committee to be denied what by law is rightfully mine. I, you know, and they do that to the managers all the time. And make up things. You know, new things...

Hauth: So, what do you, what do you propose? Art, listen, I agree with you.

A Stevenson: But anyways.

Hauth: I agree with you, program relevant information.

A Stevenson: Well, we gotta, we gotta have compliance, Randy, and people need to be held accountable. I don't, you know, a manager gets held accountable if they don't follow the rules. But at the agency, there is no accountability and there needs to be accountability. Once and for all.

Hauth: Let me share, let me, let me, let me share with you. I agree with you that program relevant information should be provided willingly and should not be withheld. I get all that. So, let's find a way, how to address it. I mean, I support your concerns. Obviously, you know I do. But let's find a way to make it, make it better, so that, you know, the information, you know, what, what are your ideas on how to make it better if you have any thoughts at this point in time?

A Stevenson: Well. You know, Randy, all I care about is following the laws and the rules and regulations. We're held accountable to it and by golly, every member that's involved in this program from OCB should be held to the same standard, period. There is no dang doubt about that. And you know, I'll say it, I've said it before, and I'll say it again, I'm tired of being treated like a second-class citizen and denied my rights under the Constitution, under the federal Randolph Sheppard Act, under the state statutes, you name it. Okay, and by golly, we have a right and the agency has to abide by the law, or they need to be held accountable and, and action be taken to them like it would be us if, if we violated something, because I know… Well, you're a perfect example, but and there's lots of managers that are a perfect example. Well, and threatening, well, if you don't do this, even though they shouldn't necessarily have to do it, you're going to lose what you got. Anyways. Enough, enough said for that. I hope we finally get some real compliance right by the agency and they are held accountable to the same standard that the managers are.

Hauth: Yeah. Hey. So.

A Stevenson: Now, there is one more, one.

Hauth: Go ahead.

A Stevenson: Go ahead. No, you first, sir.

Hauth: Well, I did want to, I did want to tell Michael he's the elephant in the room, and it would be nice if he could provide, you know, just an update, before we leave the meeting, I know you have one more item, but if Michael could provide an update on, you know, Camp Rilea and or whatever else is going on. And, you know if he wants to kind of respond, that'd be great. But go ahead, Art.

A Stevenson: Well, I mean, he can respond, but I do want to make a motion, okay, because I represent Harold Young, and he is a part of my area. And quite frankly, you know, he's got some locations that aren't very profitable, but also most of the time, well, his main location is fairgrounds, and at times there's some good money, but at other times there's not a bunch of good money and stuff. And, and, so Harold deserves to make a decent living like the rest of us on a more consistent basis. Therefore, in the city of Keizer is the courthouse where there are vending machines and they're used on a more regular basis. And the law… And I've talked to Harold about this. I mean, he's asked the agency to be assigned more so he could make a consistent income and that hasn't occurred. Well, by golly, I'm his rep and so, I'm going make a motion right now that the Keizer Courthouse, which I believe has two machines, be assigned to him and it's used more on a regular basis, and I looked at it. Which would help him, you know, make more of a regular income. So, that's the motion I'm making right now.

Hauth: Okay, do we have a second on that?

D Stevenson: I second.

Hauth: Do we have a second? Okay, so, Derrick seconded it. Any discussion? Hey, so Art, I have a couple of questions. So, you said you talked to Harold about it and he's in favor of this, correct?

A Stevenson: Oh, yeah, he wants more locations.

Hauth: Okay.

A Stevenson: In fact, he asked the agency to assign them to him.

Hauth: Okay. Okay, and do you know what kind of, where these machines... Who's servicing machines? Are they going into unassigned vending? What they're producing? Do you have any of that information at all or not?

A Stevenson: They are, they, they, they are in unassigned vending out in Keizer. I can't remember who's servicing them.

Hauth: Okay. Okay, that's all I needed to know. Thank you.

A Stevenson: Right. Yeah.

Hauth: Okay. Okay. Any other discussion? Livy, get over here. Any other discussion? Okay, hearing no discussion. I'm, I'm always in favor of, I know there hasn't been necessarily in some ways a consistent basis, but I'm all in favor of supporting a manager, especially with unassigned vending that is going into the agency as, you know, the agency has gobbled and gobbled and gobbled that up over the last 10 or 12 years, but anyway, let's go ahead and call for the vote. Yea or nay, Art?

A Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Derrick?

D Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Derrick?

A Stevenson: He said yes.

Hauth: Is Lewanda back on the line? Lewanda? Carole?

Webber: I, I don't feel comfortable with voting either way at this time.

Hauth: Okay.

A Stevenson: You can vote…

Hauth: So, I'll vote, I'll vote yea, yeah. I'll vote yea for the, for the motion, as well, because again the intended purpose of this program is not for the agency to collect unassigned vending.

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair!

Hauth: Yes?

A Stevenson: Okay. This body requested that the agency provide us with the actual unassigned vending statements from the companies as received and we got, we got a spreadsheet. But we did not get the actual reports that were submitted by the subcontractors. And so again, I want to make the motion that we receive copies of each individual report coming from the third-party contractor that they send in.

Hauth: Okay, so, a motion's been made. Do I have a second on that?

D Stevenson: I second.

Hauth: Second. Any discussion? I'll discuss this. Yeah, obviously, that's program relevant information. I thought, Art, that this was motioned and accepted by the agency that in the quarterly reports, true and accurate information in these reports, excuse me, would be provided. I may misremember that? But, clearly moving forward, this kind of thing needs to, needs to occur, in my opinion, but we'll go ahead and take a vote on this. Yea or nay, Art?

A Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Derrick?

D Stevenson: Yea.

Hauth: Lewanda? Carole?

Webber: Yea.

Hauth: I'll vote yea, as well. Okay, motion passes. So.

A Stevenson: One more, Randy.

Hauth: Okay.

A Stevenson: One more. Okay, I got the report that the agency had actually provided Lewanda a spreadsheet yesterday or the day before, one or the others. And I went through it and I saw that we have, God, I can't remember how many, but several okay, entities doing subcontracting. For instance, here in Salem, I mean, several of them in Salem. And I believe there's also several of them in Portland. And so, I would like to make a motion that we cut down the number of third-party contracts we're using and accept competitive bidding from them and choose a company that's going to bring in the most money into our program. It's ridiculous and, and give a good variety of product. Now, I know one of them was just strictly Coke. And I don't know how many of them are, but I know one of them was strictly Coke and obviously, if it was done by a third-party contract that provided Coke and Pepsi, that would be better service to these different locations. And so, I want to make a motion that we cut them down, let them competitively bid on them, but that we maximize the amount of money that's coming into the program by doing the process that I just described. Do I need to clear that up? Are we going to get a second? Did I fall off the line?

D Stevenson: No.

A Stevenson: Nobody's going to second us maybe making more money?

Wolff: Not, Art, Art. Art, Art, Art, I can hear you, so, I can hear you.

A Stevenson: Okay.

Hauth: Hey, I was on mute, I was, I was on mute, so, anyway, so, I was trying to understand what you're saying. I know in good faith you're trying to get more program money, right? Trying to get more information into the program. In all honesty, I could give a rip because they're just taking it and gobbling it up into unassigned vending. One part of me says who cares, because they're violating the law the way it is now. But hopefully someday, that will change. So, clearly, you know, it's important that these third-party contractors...

A Stevenson: Okay, I’ll make another, I'll make another motion after we do this, Randy. Just to make...

Hauth: Yeah, so anyway, the motion's been, yeah, your, your motion's been made and a second. Do we have a second?

D Stevenson: I second.

Hauth: Okay, any discussion?

Webber: Mr. Chair?

Hauth: Yes, Carole?

Webber: Okay, I'm not understanding, I'm not understanding what Art's talking about and what the problem is. This is the first time I've ever heard of this. So.

A Stevenson: Okay.

Hauth: Yeah, Art, I mean, I don't quite, I don't, I don’t quite get it either. I know in good faith you're trying to get more money into the program but what would that look like and what are you, what are you saying?

A Stevenson: Well and better service, too, Randy. Like for instance, one of the companies is Coke itself. So, obviously, those vending machines truly only have Coke products in it. Well, what if, you know, what if the building wants Coke and Pepsi? And that, you know, that's giving them good service and stuff like that, Randy. And so, that would help in that manner. Obviously, you know, I'll use Canteen as an example. They, they provide Coke and Pepsi and therefore you know, the building is getting better service and the products that they want. And so, I believe it's our obligation to make sure that each location gets the maximized amount of product from the third-party contractor. I mean that's just, to me, that's a no-brainer. So, that's why, you know, I wanted to, you know, us to get rid of or the agency to get rid of all of that. And then, as far as the money goes, I will be making another motion concerning that, because like I said, the time has come for the agency to comply with the law and do what benefits and brings money into the pockets of the managers, which is what the requirement is. So, anyways, that's, that's why I'm doing this, guys. I believe our customers deserve, you know… First of all, we need to maximize the amount of money coming in. We got to make sure that money goes to blind licensed managers, not to the agency. But that'll come in my next motion.

Hauth: So, a motion's been made. Did we get a second on that? I'm sorry. Yes, we did have a second, correct?

A Stevenson: I thought I heard Derrick, but…

Hauth: Yeah, Derrick, did you second that?

D Stevenson: I believe so. Can you hear me?

Hauth: Okay. And with discussion. Yeah, I can hear you. Anyway, so, let's go ahead and vote on this. Art?

A Stevenson: Yes.

Hauth: Derrick?

D Stevenson: Yes.

Hauth: Carole?

Webber: Yea.

Hauth: I'll vote yea, as well. With that said, let's move on.

A Stevenson: Mr. Chair!

Hauth: I do want to hear, you know, and honestly, Art, I appreciate your advocacy and the motions. I, I do hope truly that you have intended a strategy behind these because again, like I said, earlier, the agency many times denies our motions doesn't care about our motions. So, unless…

A Stevenson: Compliance, Randy, compliance. We're going to have it, one way or the other.

Hauth: Okay. Okay. Okay. Again, I, I support what you're getting at, I just want to make sure that you have a, you know, strategy in place. So, go ahead, Art. Okay.

Wolff: Just Mr. Chair, Mr. Vice-Chair, just really quickly, I, I need to get go--, we're 10 minutes over. So, I was trying to keep track of time and make sure I probably…

Hauth: Yeah, and I think, that yeah, I.

Wolff: I just want to make sure you're keeping track of time.

Hauth: You know, I do think it's important. Yeah, thank you. I do think it's important to hear from Michael. I mean, you know, here we've talked about the agency, and we've talked about a lot of the what we believe are failures of the agency, which you know, I concur in many instances, but I think to properly participate with the agency, we need to get some feedback. You know, too often we let Eric sit there and say nothing and I don't think that's the best way for us to interact. So, while I support making motions to document, I do believe we need to also hear an update or engage with the agency. So, I don’t know, Michael, if you have any update that you can give us, you know, what's going on, what's going on with Camp Rilea, what's going on in general? If you do, please take a couple of minutes, and share that.

Wolff: Yeah, I don't have a ton of updates. I mean, I think individually I've touched base with a few of you over the last few weeks and talked about what you're doing, and stuff. And you know, as far as Camp Rilea, I try just to be as thoughtful as I can about that because, you know, it's a VFM's place and I want to be thoughtful about that. So. We were out there, so, with Robert and so, but yeah, I just want to be thoughtful about how I share that information. So, and that's just me getting used to the role, too. So, you know.

Hauth: Sure. Sure, no, I, you know, I get that, you know, you know, I do know that, anyway… I won't say anymore. I understand Art's concerns and I also understand your newness in the role and also Robert being there in his facility. So, let's, Art, if you, if you want to make another motion before we close out, please go ahead and do so and we can talk more about the other issues.

A Stevenson: Oh yeah, well, Randy.

Wolff: And just.

A Stevenson: Okay.

Hauth: Go ahead, Art, yeah, and then we'll close out.

A Stevenson: Yeah, I’ll make, I'll make, I'm going to make one more motion.

Hauth: Go ahead.

A Stevenson: The law states, the law states, okay. If money is to be set aside or caused to be set aside from the net proceeds of the vending facility, then, you know, the agency is entitled to, with the active participation of the Elected Committee, to set amount of, amount of set-aside that we are to pay. Okay. It does not mean that the agency can take unassigned vending machine income and put it into set-aside without the permission of the Elected Committee.

Hauth: Quick.

A Stevenson: They have done so. And this is a violation of the law.

Hauth: Make your motion, brother!

A Stevenson: Okay, I make a motion that any and all money, money that we are receiving from now on not be put into set-aside and that it be distributed equally to the blind licensed managers until we could possibly make a different kind of thing.

Hauth: Well, Art.

A Stevenson: But this needs to happen now.

Hauth: I think we already made a mo--, I think we already made a motion on this a few meetings ago. Let's, let's go ahead and close out the meeting and let's circle back to this. So, I mean, you know, with all due respect, I want to close the meeting out. We'll let Michael go. We'll talk more and we'll bring this up at another meeting if we need to. So. Any, anything else before, anybody? Okay, thank you everybody for joining in and let's go ahead and adjourn.

Wolff: Thank you.

**Motions Passed**

1. **“…that every member of BECC be allowed to participate in every step of the hiring process**

Proposed: A Stevenson. Seconded: D Stevenson. Passed. No: Nays: Hauth, Miranda, Webber Yeas: A Stevenson D Stevenson. Absent: Jackson

1. **“…that Robert be added to Carole’s BECC Outlying Area**

Proposed: A Stevenson. Seconded: Miranda. Passed. Yes: Yeas, Hauth, A Stevenson, D Stevenson, Webber, Miranda. Absent: Jackson

1. **“…that BE rules be null and void**

Proposed: A Stevenson. Seconded: D Stevenson. Passed. Yes: Yeas, Hauth, Webber, A Stevenson, D Stevenson. Absent: Miranda, Jackson

1. **“…that Harold be given the Keizer Courthouse from Unassigned Vending**

Proposed: A Stevenson. Seconded: D Stevenson. Passed. Yes: Yeas, Hauth, A Stevenson, D Stevenson Absent: Jackson, Miranda. Didn’t vote: Webber

1. **“…that VFMs be given the monthly subcontractor commission reports**

Proposed: A Stevenson. Seconded: D Stevenson. Passed. Yes: Yeas, Hauth, Webber, A Stevenson, D Stevenson. Absent: Jackson, Miranda

1. **“…that number of third-party subcontractors be cut down, and that competitive bidding be done for unassigned sites**

Proposed: A Stevenson. Seconded: D Stevenson. Passed. Yes: Yeas, Hauth, Webber, A Stevenson, D Stevenson

1. **“…that unassigned vending commission monies not be put into set-aside and instead be distributed equally among VFMS**

Proposed: A Stevenson. Seconded: none. Passed. No: Never voted