

Agenda

Enterprise Asset Management

Customer Utility Board



Members:

Marc Williams - Chair
DOJ

Vacant - Vice-Chair

Ralph Amador
DHS/OHA

Christian Grorud
Oregon Marine Board

Teddy Leland
DLCD

Lori LeVeaux
ODFW

Vacant
Secretary of State

Gene Bentley
Real Estate

Vacant
ODOT

Cort Dokken
State Police

Jason Barber
Agriculture

David Moon
Oregon Judicial Dept

DAS Support Staff:

Bret West
Interim CAO

Shannon Ryan
EAM Administrator

Janet Savarro
DBS Administrator

John Fox
DBS Analyst

Debby Dyer
Administrative Support

Meeting Date: March 8, 2017

Time: 1:00-3:00 p.m.

Location: Somerville Building | 775 Court St. NE

ITEM	PRESENTER	TIME
Welcome		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and review of last meeting minutes and action items 	Marc Williams	1:00 - 1:05
Chair/Vice-Chair Meeting with Katy Coba		
	Marc Williams Bret West	1:05 - 1:15
Quarterly Performance Reports/Qtrs. 3 & 4		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fleet and Parking Maintenance Planning & Construction Mgmt. Real Estate Surplus 	Brian King Jeremy Miller Barry Jones Eric Grindy Sven Anderson	1:15 – 1:45
Fleet Management Policy Changes		
	Brian King	1:45 – 1:55
Reduction Exercise		
	Shannon Ryan	1:55 – 2:05
CUB Vacancies		
	Marc Williams	2:05 – 2:15
Sustainability discussion		
	Shannon Ryan	2:15 – 2:30
EAM Leadership Retreat update		
	Shannon Ryan	2:30 – 3:00

Next meeting:

TBD
1:00-3:00 p.m.
775 Court St. NE
Salem, Oregon 97301

Minutes

Enterprise Asset Management

Customer Utility Board



Members:

Marc Williams – Chair
DOJ

Vacant– Vice-Chair

Ralph Amador
DHS/OHA

Gene Bentley
Real Estate

David Moon
Judicial

Fabiola Flores
Secretary of State

Christian Grorud
OSMB

Jason Barber
Agriculture

Teddy Leland
DLCD

Lori LeVeaux
ODFW

Vacant
ODOT

Vacant
State Police

DAS Support Staff

Bret West
Interim CAO

Shannon Ryan
EAM Administrator

Janet Savarro
DBS Administrator

John Fox
EAM Analyst

Debby Dyer
Administrative Support

Meeting Date: October 12, 2016

Time: 1:00-3:00 p.m.

Location: Somerville Building | 775 Court St. NE

Attendees: Jason Barber, Gene Bentley, Ralph Amador, Marc Williams, Lori LeVeaux, David Moon, Fabiola Flores

DAS Support: Shannon Ryan, Jeremy Miller, Brian King, Sven Anderson, Barry Jones, Ty Hendrix, John Fox, Eric Grindy, Eric Sexton,

Guests: Alice Wiewel, Mike P.

Absent: Christian Grorud, Rick Willis, Teddy Leland,

TOPIC	PRESENTER
Welcome	Marc Williams
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and introductions – new member Ralph Amador from DHS Review minutes – action item on today’s minutes – minutes approved 	
CUB Satisfaction Survey	Ty Hendrix
Action: Put on March 2017 agenda	
Q1 & Q2 Performance Reports	EAM Managers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fleet and Parking: #2 – <u>Percentage of fleet beyond optimal replacement schedule.</u> Target not met and won’t be for the foreseeable future. This is just when vehicles are coming in and getting replaced. #8 – <u>Percentage of times DAS customers are billed within the same month of a work order being finished or a vendor invoice is received.</u> Recommend changing target – members agreed to put this one on the shelf for now. Maintenance: #2 – <u>Percentage of non-emergency work orders that remain open after 10 business days.</u> Target not met – will always be around 13 #4 – <u>Percentage of work orders closed after 30 days.</u> Target not met – mostly due to ordering parts on larger jobs. Planning & Construction Mgmt: # 2 & 5 - no data – no survey responses. #7 – <u>Percentage of times projects are completed within 10% of the initially agreed upon budget.</u> Target not met – big fluctuations in bids. Wants to continue to monitor to see the trends. Real Estate: All targets met – possible that some data was missed- will do more research. In the next 12 months there will be some leveling in the market. Members would like to see targets set – will begin setting targets with one more quarter of data. 	<p>Brian King</p> <p>Jeremy Miller</p> <p>Barry Jones</p> <p>Eric Grindy</p> <p>Sven Anderson</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surplus: #2 – <u>Percentage of accountable surplus property items located during inventory.</u> Target not met – recommend changing target – more research needed. Members suggested entering the inventory into the computer system upon arrival instead of having the person who sent it entering it into the system. Continue to monitor. 	
Reduction Exercise	Shannon Ryan
Action: Put on December agenda	
Legislative Concepts Update	Shannon Ryan
<p>Have previously gone over the entire list of Leg concepts with members. Not going forward with the following concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease Option – giving us permission to have a lease option as part of our lease agreement from the beginning. Non-obligatory lease option • GSA Model – DAS would be the master tenant on every single lease 	
Cascadia DeBrief Oregon Resilience Program	Alice Wiewel
<p>Alice brought a slide presentation to share with CUB members. (see handout)</p> <p><u>Oregon Resilience Program</u></p> <p>Program Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Facilities Condition Assessment</i> • <i>Natural Hazards</i> • <i>Workplace Strategy</i> • <i>Findings:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continuity of Government 2. Seismic remediation 3. Modernization <p>Plan: Ten years of projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Strategic Facilities Plan</i> • <i>Prioritized Implementation Strategy</i> • <i>Seismic Renovations</i> • <i>Workspace Strategy</i> <p>Buildings: Concept</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A different kind of building that will perform.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Higher Performance means less loss. • <i>Performance</i> <p>Features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Structural</i> • <i>Passive design</i> • <i>Energy</i> • <i>Temperature ranges</i> • <i>Non-structural</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bracing 2. Seismically-rated components <p>Benefits are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Faster recovery</i> • <i>Critical service delivery</i> • <i>Accelerated DAS Facilities Updates</i> • <i>Cost Savings</i> 	

Vice Chair Vacancy	Marc Williams
Action: Put on December agenda	
Meeting Cadence	Marc Williams
Members agreed to meeting every other month	
Action Items	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email copy of Alice's slide deck to CUB members – Done • Send hyperlink to Operations SLA agreement - Done 	

Next meeting:

December 14, 2016

1:00-3:00 p.m.

Somerville Building

775 Court St. NE

Salem, Oregon 97301

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Fleet and Parking				In compliance	
Reporting Period		Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)				Out of Compliance	
						No Data or Lack of Target	
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2016 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2016 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2016 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	Average repair cost per mile	Tracked as a monitoring metric: Cost per mile.	\$0.039	\$0.039	\$0.038	\$0.038	
	Sum of repair costs		1,428,736	1,416,268	1,398,003	1,390,756	
	Total # of miles travelled		36,917,249	36,397,067	36,513,172	37,004,436	
2	% of fleet beyond optimal replacement schedule	≤ 9%	11.5%	12.8%	12.9%	12.9%	
	Total # of vehicles beyond replacement schedule		418	468	480	474	
	Total # of vehicles		3,638	3,664	3,719	3,664	
3	% of rental vehicle requests fulfilled with type of vehicle requested	≥ 95%	99.7%	98.7%	99.3%	99.2%	
	# of requests fulfilled with requested type		289	313	269	254	
	Total # of survey responses		290	317	271	256	
4	% of vehicles taken to the shop for rework repairs	≤ 4%	3.9%	3.5%	4.5%	3.1%	
	# of reported rework incidents		6	5	5	4	
	Total # of survey responses		155	143	112	127	
5	Average Customer Satisfaction rating of vendors performing maintenance and repair services (1-10)	≥ 8	8.59	8.62	8.66	8.74	
	Sum of customer satisfaction ratings		2,431	2,337	1,809	1,801	
	Total # of survey responses		283	271	209	206	
6	% of vehicles available for pick up from preventative maintenance services in less than 1 day	≥ 80%	77.9%	81.4%	85.4%	84.3%	
	# of reported PM vehicles ready for pick up in less than 1 day		166	149	123	102	
	Total # of survey responses		213	183	144	121	
7	% of vehicles available for pick up from repair services in less than 2 days	≥ 80%	83.6%	85.0%	86.0%	88.5%	
	# of reported RS vehicles ready for pick up in less than 2 days		127	119	92	108	
	Total # of survey responses		152	140	107	122	

Measure	Comments
1. Average repair cost per mile	General Comments
	Trend continues to be slightly down, which is good. However, the program has been seeing a good many vehicles that have mechanical failures but are not at replacement miles. These are most removed from service and sold versus repairing, which could account for some of the flat trend.
2. Fleet replacement status	General Comments
	Steady. At end of the biennium, will reevaluate 9% target to see if it is realistic compared to the number of vehicles we intentionally keep past optimal replacement
3. Daily rental vehicle fulfillment	General Comments
	Reset targets? Perhaps to 98.5%?
4. Repair comeback rate	General Comments
	First time in awhile that the measure did not need to be looked at in detail and adjusted for false positive results!
5. Rating of maintenance vendors	General Comments
	Continues to be good, perhaps raise target to 8.5 out of 9?
6. Downtime for preventative maintenance	General Comments
	Positive trend and likely about where we should be
7. Downtime for repairs/breakdown	General Comments
	very positive trend. Unsure if this will continue.

Name of Program/ Division	FLEET & PARKING
Date report is finalized	2/27/2017
Reporting Period	Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Complainant (Agency and, if applicable, Dept.)	Affected Customer (s)	Description

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Planning and Construction Management				In compliance	
Reporting Period		Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)				Out of Compliance	
						No Data or Lack of Target	
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2016 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2016 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2016 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	Average rating of quality of completed plans (1-5)	≥ 4.5	5.0	No Data	No Data	No Data	
	Sum of the ratings to specific question		10				
	Total # of survey responses		2				
2	Average rating of quality of completed projects (1-5)	≥ 4.5	4.5	No Data	No Data	No Data	
	Sum of the ratings to specific question		9				
	Total # of survey responses		2				
3	% of times a decision on a project is communicated back to the agency within 8 calendar days	≥ 100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
	# of projects with a communicated decision within 8 days of request		18	16	11	9	
	Total # of projects with a communicated decision		18	16	11	9	
4	% of projects completed by the agreed upon date	≥ 90%	100%	90%	75%	83%	
	# of projects completed by the agreed upon date		4	9	3	5	
	# of projects completed		4	10	4	6	
5	Average rating of timely communication throughout project (1-5)	≥ 4.5	4.5	No Data	No Data	No Data	
	Sum of the ratings to specific question		9				
	Total # of survey responses		2				
6	% of times projects are completed within 10% of the initially agreed upon timeline	≥ 90%	25.0%	90.0%	75.0%	83.3%	
	# of projects that were completed within 10% of original timeframe		1	9	3	5	
	Total # of projects completed		4	10	4	6	
7	% of times projects are completed within 10% of the initially agreed upon budget	≥ 87%	50.0%	70.0%	0.0%	66.7%	
	# of projects completed within 10% of original budget		2	7	0	4	
	Total # of projects completed		4	10	4	6	

Comments for Performance Measures

Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. **Click on the measure** on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.

Measure	Comments
1. Average Rating of question "How well did the completed plans meet your needs?"	<p align="center">General Comments</p> No Surveys were received for this quarter
2. Average rating of question "How well did the completed project meet your needs?"	<p align="center">General Comments</p> No Surveys were received for this quarter
3. % of times a decision on a project is communicated back to the agency within 8 calendar days	<p align="center">General Comments</p>
4. % of projects completed by the agreed upon date	<p align="center">General Comments</p> One project was reassigned to another PM because of failure to meet the initial timeline. Second agreed to timeline was met.
5. Timely communication throughout project	<p align="center">General Comments</p> No Surveys were received for this quarter
6. % of times P&CM meets the projects predicted hours	<p align="center">General Comments</p> One project was reassigned to another PM because of failure to meet the initial timeline. Second agreed to timeline was met.
7. % of times P&CM meets the projects predicted hours	<p align="center">General Comments</p> 4 out of the six projects were within 10%. The other two were 25% and 21% under initial budget

Name of Program/ Division

Planning and Construction Management

Reporting Period

Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Affected Customer (s)	Description	
1					
2					
3					
4					

SLA Quarterly Performance Report

Name of Program/ Division

DAS Real Estate Services

In compliance

Reporting Period

Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)

Out of Compliance

No Data or Lack of Target

Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2016 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2016 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2016 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
2a	% of lease contracts with rates below or at the applicable geographic market rates (Above 5,000 SqFt.)	TBD	75%	53%	70%	78.6%	
	Total # of leases signed with rates at or under market rates		9	8	7	11	
	Total # of leases signed		12	15	10	14	
2b	% of lease contracts with rates below or at the applicable geographic market rates (Below 5,000 SqFt.)	TBD	81%	40%	81%	66.7%	
	Total # of leases signed with rates at or under market rates		13	8	17	12	
	Total # of leases signed		16	20	21	18	
5	# of critical lease dates missed	0	4	0	0	0	
	Total # of critical lease dates		28	0	0	0	
6	% of private lease portfolio contracts on 5-year or longer lease terms	TBD	54%	24%	39%	45.5%	
	# of contracts in the private lease portfolio with leases of 5 years or more		15	12	16	15	
	Total # of contracts in the private lease portfolio		28	50	41	33	
7	Average rating of the quality of completed projects	TBD	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	
	Sum of the ratings to specific question						
	Total # of survey responses						

Comments for Performance Measures

Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. **Click on the measure** on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.

Measure	Comments
1. Lease rate vs. average market rate for the applicable geographic regions	<p align="center">General Comments</p>
2. % of lease contracts with rates below or at the applicable geographic market rates	<p align="center">General Comments</p>
5. # of critical lease dates missed	<p align="center">General Comments</p>
6. % of lease portfolio contracts on 5-year or longer lease terms	<p align="center">General Comments</p>
7. Average rating of quality of completed projects	<p align="center">General Comments</p>

Name of Program/ Division

DAS Real Estate Services

Reporting Period

Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	No Data	Affected Customer (s)	Description

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Surplus				In compliance	
Reporting Period		Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)				Out of Compliance	
						No Data or Lack of Target	
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2016 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2016 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2016 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	% of disposed vehicles reimbursed that went through the disposition process in less than 55 days	≥ 80%	89.3%	83.2%	87.7%	84.0%	
	# of disposed vehicles reimbursed within 55 days		150	173	193	199	
	Total # of disposed vehicles reimbursed		168	208	220	237	
2	% of accountable surplus property items located during inventory	≥ 97%	96.8%	94.6%	95.3%	73.3%	
	Total # of accountable surplus items found during inventory		634	511	650	691	
	Total # of accountable surplus items		655	540	682	943	
3	% of hard-drives selected for audit scrubbed by e-waste vendor to verify full erasure of data	≥ 100%	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	
	# of hard-drives analyzed that had been successfully wiped						
	# of hard-drives analyzed						
4	Average rating for overall satisfaction of Surplus Property Program (1-5)	TBD	4.42	4.75	4.80	4.76	
	Sum of the ratings given by survey respondents		261	328	216	238	
	# of survey responses		59	69	45	50	

Comments for Performance Measures	
Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. Click on the measure on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.	
Measure	Comments
1. Timeliness of end-to-end vehicle disposition process	General Comments
2. Accuracy of inventory reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huge influx of furniture from DHS & DEQ which was 40% greater quantity than information provided to Surplus and arrived in a very condensed time frame versus the originally planned schedule. • Regular employee that handles this furniture was assisting ODOT due to their staffing issue. • Temporary employee hired to handle furniture and it was determined that information was not being accurately entered into the database. This resulted in inventory that was recycled not being removed from inventory and additional inventory items being created that never existed. • Monthly inventory was not performed during this period.
3. IT asset data scrubbing audits	General Comments
4. Average rating for overall satisfaction of surplus property program (1-5)	General Comments

Name of Program/ Division **SURPLUS PROPERTY**

Reporting period **Q4 2016 (Oct-Dec)**

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Complainant (Agency and, if applicable, Dept.)	Affected Customer (s)	Description
1					None to report
2					
3					

Changes to Statewide Fleet Management Policy 107-011-040

III. REPLACEMENT AND DISPOSITION

Hybrid and CNG replacement miles from 175K to 150 K:

Hybrid and CNG vehicles, 150,000 miles for all		
Depreciation Months	Mileage Range	Replacement Years Schedule
120	1250 or less miles per month	10
108	1251 to 1389 miles per month	9
96	1390 to 1563 miles per month	8
84	1564 to 1786 miles per month	7
72	1787 to 2083 miles per month	6
60	2084 to 2500 miles per month	5
48	2501 to 3125 miles per month	4
36	3126 to 4167 miles per month	3

IV. EFFICIENT AND ECONOMICAL USE OF STATE VEHICLES

New exemption request added:

6. Hybrids only: Vehicle is used an average of 15 business days a month or more **and** travels more than 250 miles per month on average. Agencies requesting this exemption must provide documentation of use. For example, copies of a reservation calendar or scheduling system for the year or other record of the days used per month.

Updated language on hybrid utilization:

4. Underused hybrid vehicles:
 - a. The state gets the most efficient and cost effective use of hybrid vehicles when they travel a minimum of 750 miles per month, the minimum mileage point for hybrids.
 - b. Agencies may request an exemption for hybrids that do not average 750 miles per month. To meet the exemption criteria, the hybrid vehicle must be utilized an average of 15 business days a month or more. In addition, the hybrid vehicle must travel at least 250 miles per month on average or the agency may not request this exemption. If these parameters are not met, the agency must follow the removal process outlined above for vehicles that do not meet minimum use requirements.
 - c. Agencies with any hybrid vehicles that do not meet the 750 minimum use requirement or are not granted an exemption may not purchase additional new vehicles or request additional new vehicles from DAS Fleet. Vehicles due for replacement may be replaced.

PROVIDING ELECTRICITY TO EMPLOYEES AND THE PUBLIC FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING

Added lower minimum rate for small kWh battery vehicles or half day users.

5. To recoup the cost of providing workplace charging:

- a. Full Charging: a minimal charge of no less than \$20 per month must be paid by an employee using an agency-owned 110 volt outlet or Level 1 charger for all day or overnight charging of a personal vehicle, or for using an agency-owned 240 volt outlet or Level 2 charger. This is a flat monthly charge and will not be prorated based on how many days the charging actually occurred during the month. An agency may charge a higher rate if necessary to recover costs outlined in Section 4.
- b. Partial Charging (includes full charging of vehicles with battery capacity of less than 10 kWh): a minimal charge of no less than \$10 per month must be paid by an employee using an agency-owned 110 volt outlet or Level 1 charger for a half day (4.5hrs) or less to charge a personal vehicle, or for using an agency-owned 240 volt outlet or Level 2 charger. This is a flat monthly charge and will not be prorated based on how many days the charging actually occurred during the month. An agency may charge a higher rate if necessary to recover costs outlined in Section 4.

Department of Administrative Services - Enterprise Asset Management
Customer Utility Board - March 8, 2017

	2017-19 EAM - Reduction Options (millions)			
	10% CSL Limitation	12% CSL Revenue	Included in GRB	15% CSL Limitation
Operations and Maintenance				
SS building tenants pay utility costs directly				\$ 3.928
Eliminate excess utility limitation for UR bldgs	\$ 1.973	\$ 1.973	\$ 1.973	1.973
Change temp set point range in UR bldgs	0.401			0.401
Direct contract for custodial in SS bldgs	0.397	0.397	0.397	0.397
Sell Albina building - reduce limitation	1.237	1.237		1.237
Sell Blind Commission building - reduce limitation	0.487	0.487		0.487
Eliminate building maintenance for crime labs	0.197	0.197	0.197	0.197
Reduce maintenance services for UR bldgs *	0.550	0.550	0.550	0.550
Increase vacancy savings factor		0.099		
Fleet and Parking Services				
Eliminate excess fuel limitation	1.384	1.384	1.384	1.384
Discontinue services to IGA customers	2.710	2.710		2.710
Delay purchase of 46 replacement vehicles				1.000
75% reduction in seasonal vehicle pool	0.520			0.520
Adjust ending working capital to 30 days		8.290	8.290	
	<u>\$ 9.857</u>	<u>\$ 17.324</u>	<u>\$ 12.791</u>	<u>\$ 14.785</u>

UR = Uniform Rent Buildings, SS = Self Support Buildings

** Eliminate window washing, power washing, parking lot sweeping, reduce frequency for landscape contracts, compactor maintenance, and reduce carpet cleaning frequency.*

	2017-19 (millions)	
	ARB	GRB
Capital Project Fund		
Capital Improvement	\$ 4.566	\$ 4.566
Human Services Upgrades (electrical)	3.743	
Employment Building Upgrades (plumbing/flooring)	6.236	
Electrical Upgrades and Replacements	3.890	
Capital Mall Parking Structure Study	2.926	
Planning	0.500	
Boiler and Heater Upgrades	1.234	
Portland Crime Lab Upgrade (chiller & walls)	1.162	
Parking Lot Upgrades	3.500	
Mission Critical Facility (planning only, keep UR rate at \$1.45 sq. ft.)		9.329
	<u>\$ 27.757</u>	<u>\$ 13.896</u>
Mission Critical Facility (Article XI-Q bond)		
2017-19	\$ 56.500	
2019-21	104.500	
	<u>\$ 161.000</u>	<u>\$ -</u>
PSOB Repairs (Article XI-Q bond)		
2017-19	\$ 13.146	
2019-21	8.000	
	<u>\$ 21.146</u>	<u>\$ -</u>