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**Transcript**

Hauth: Alright, well, let's go ahead and get this meeting going. And I guess if people call in, we'll -- we'll introduce them as well. So we'll start with the Board, make sure we have a quorum here. Roll call. Derrick Stevenson? Art Stevenson? Yeah, I know Art -- now you're on mute, but I know you're here.

Miranda: Yeah.

Hauth: [inaudible]

Art Stevenson: I'm here.

Hauth: OK. Lewa -- Lewanda Miranda?

Miranda: Here.

Hauth: Lin Jaynes?

Jaynes: Present.

Hauth: Steve Jackson?

Jackson: I'm right here. Hi guys.

Hauth: Hey Steve. And I'm here as well, so we have a quorum. I think we're only missing Derrick. So we'll go on with the vendorship. Carole Kinney?

Kinney: I'm here.

Hauth: Hi Carole. I thought I heard your voice earlier. Char Mc -- Char Hawkins? OK. Sal Barraza? Harold Young? Jerry Bird? Trevor Garcia?

Garcia: Yeah, I'm here.

Hauth: Hey Trevor. Celyn Brown? Joseph Becker? Shawn Bever? OK. Is there anybody in the managers that I left off? OK. And any audience members would like to introduce themself, please do so.

Haseman: Linda Haseman's here.

Hauth: Hey Linda.

Jackson: Hi Linda.

Hauth: OK. Thanks --  thanks for joining us. Alright. Again, as people pop in, if they do, we'll -- we'll -- we'll see who it is. Lin, if you could help guide me through the agenda, that'd be great.

Jaynes: OK. After the roll call will be the adoption of past meeting minutes.

Hauth: OK. We all received the previous minutes, so I'll entertain a motion to adopt those minutes as recorded. Do we have a motion?

Jackson: I make a motion --

Hauth: OK. A motion --

Jackson: I make a motion to adopt --

Hauth: Motion has been made by Steve Jackson. Second?

Jaynes: I second.

Miranda: Lewanda seconds.

Hauth: OK. A second's been made. Two seconds have been made. And so yea or nay, Art Stevenson? [inaudible] Art, you're still on mute.

Art Stevenson: Yes.

Hauth: OK. Lin Jaynes?

Jaynes: Yea.

Hauth: Lewanda Miranda?

Miranda: Yes.

Hauth: Steve Jackson?

Jackson: Yes.

Hauth: And I'll vote yea as well. OK, motion passes. What do we have next on the agenda, Lin?

Jaynes: Next -- next on the agenda is open comment.

Hauth: OK. Open comment. I do want to start just with a little housekeeping in a...I guess maybe in an open comment arena. We did invite Linda Haseman to [inaudible] on the agenda to go over the financials and give us a cursory review update on this. I will share that recently I sent a question out to the Board members saying, "Can you access these quarterlies? The last quarterlies that came out, can you access 'em?" And, you know, there was not one vendor that said, "Yeah, it's -- it's totally accessible. I can navigate it fine." Some said, "Well, I can navigate some of it," and some said, "I can't navigate it at all." So when I talked to Linda about that, we also went over the quarterlies and there were some other issues within there that there were some questions raised to Director Morris that were trying to understand and work through with the end goal being that, you know, if there's a problem with people accessing that form, let's find a way, and if there's a -- a problem with, especially a Board member, not understanding that form, let's find a way that we can get all that done, right? And so also, real quickly, let's keep in mind the protocol, the business protocol, that we adopted recently and that talks about, you know, a professional workplace here during the meeting, you know, we can agree to disagree, but let's try and remember to be respectful. And if we do get -- if we do get, you know, heated or worked up or excited about an issue that's impacting our fellow managers or ourselves, let's make sure and take -- take a break and, you know, if it's getting out of hand -- not that it is, but if it is on either side, let's take a break and come back and, you know, the end goal is trying to work through these things. I know a lot of times we're on opposite sides of the fence, or we feel we are with the agency, but let's try and find that somehow common ground, if we can. And also as far as time, I'm surprised I haven't been cut off yet by Lewanda, the timekeeper. I do know [inaudible] -- I do know we talked about keeping time, making sure that, you know, there's people like me or Jerry or Art or, you know, others that might feel passionate about a issue and may take the floor and debate it or talk about it, so we want to make sure that everybody gets a chance to get in there, so if somebody gets into a situation where they're talking about an issue and it gets rather lengthy, then to ask Lewanda just to remind us to, you know, keep on topic and get back. And last but not least, real quickly, again, you know, there's been times when managers have come to me and said, "Hey, lookit, when we go to the agency and we ask questions, we never can get really -- or, many times we can't get the answer that we're seeking, and so part of the protocol was also -- and you know, maybe, you know, to Eric's behalf and to the defense of Eric, maybe sometimes he wasn't aware of the question that was going to be asked, and so he has to go research it, and that's another reason that we sent questions ahead of time, so the agency would have a chance to be able to go through and be prepared to do something. Anyway, enough out of me. Anybody would like to make a public comment? OK. No public comment.

Jackson: Steve Jackson.

Hauth: Hey, Steve. Go ahead.

Jackson: I wanna just say thank you to Eric for sending out the checks, the relief checks. I got mine. And -- and, you know, it's just really helpful, and also wanted to say that Kathy Ewing has been very helpful to me lately, working with my new vending machines. I only have two, but I just wanted Eric to hear that, that she's super helpful. And she's a keeper.

Hauth: Alright. Thank you. Anyone else?

Garcia: Yeah, Trevor here.

Hauth: OK. Trevor?

Garcia: Sorry about that. Yeah. Kathy's been very helpful. And I think that role she plays, you know, she tries to do a diligent job, and I think she does, and so definitely wanna give a commendation for that.

Hauth: Alright. Thank you, Trevor. Anyone else? OK. What do we have next on the agenda, Lin?

Jaynes: Next on the agenda is budget and financials - Linda Haseman.

Hauth: OK. So let me ask, Linda, if you're on the -- are you still on the line? Linda, are you on the line? Think you might be muted. Hello?

Haseman: Hey, I'm here. I'm sorry. I'm on a new phone, and so --

Hauth: OK.

Haseman: -- I'm having trouble trying to figure out how to get to a new place, so. Yes, I'm here.

Hauth: OK. Well...OK, so, the question is this: are you...are you prepared to update us on this matter? I know I told Linda that the meeting didn't start till 3:30, so my bad on that. Then I found out it starts at three, so I don't know if we want to move this...this item a little bit further down, or are you ready to go?

Haseman: I -- I -- Actually, I think I'm ready. Yeah.

Hauth: Alright, alright, alright. Well, again, real quickly, Linda, you know, Linda's been a real great advocate on behalf of many of the managers and has helped us understand things. She came from the HR background through a school district up in Washington and was involved in budgeting and other matters, and so she's not only been helpful to me, but I know she's been helpful to others. And I received a request from a manager who said, "Hey, can Linda update us on the quarterlies and what she's finding and what she's seeing, because we're really unable to navigate that or even understand it." So with that, Linda, the floor is yours.

Haseman: OK. Thank you. I just wanna -- I think it's a little lower on the agenda, but it's all tied to me as well. You had mentioned about the accessibility. And I wanted to share with individuals that I did go out and look, and there's a couple of helpful tools. I'm not sure that the Excel spreadsheet is actually set up to all the accessibility requirements that it's supposed to. I know Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act requires accessible documents, including Excel spreadsheets. And Excel spreadsheets can be tricky anyways, let alone likely with a screen reader or a vision deficiency, so I did some research on that. There's some -- I'm just trying to share this for both the managers and the agency, that there's some very helpful tools out on the website -- or, out on the World Wide Web, tied to creating accessible Excel spreadsheets. I did notice when I recently went into the RSA, I guess it was the Legislative Report that Eric and this agency put together. It actually is denoted that it's an accessible PDF when you go to open it. I don't know that I've seen where the Excel spreadsheets have indicated that they're an accessible Excel spreadsheet. But what I found out from looking around is that a lot of universities have put together some videos and ways to make things easier, and I actually found through the Department of Rehab in California that they put together a seven-step process in creating accessible spreadsheets, and it might be helpful for the agency to maybe revisit this if it's been a while since they re -- had looked at it or not -- but -- for instance, step one, it says to add alternate text to images and objects. Step two is to -- and it goes through and explains how to do that -- step two is, specify column header, row, and tables. It even says to make sure there's something denoted into the Excel spreadsheet at the end of one table before you go to a next if this is the end of the table so that JAWS knows that -- and notifies the screen rea -- or, the reader, that you're done now with that particular table. Step three is to create meaningful hyperlinks text so that it helps people be able to go over and understand what is actually being explained. Step four, other constructive criticisms [construction considerations]: avoid blank cells, rows, and columns; do not merge or split cells. Step five, give all sheet tabs unique names. Step six, include alternate formats for multimedia. Step seven, and this is what I found very interesting, is there's actually a Microsoft Excel check accessibility out there. So once a person has developed an Excel spreadsheet, they can run it through the Microsoft checker, and -- and it will determine whether it's accessible or not. So that was something very helpful. And then I also read, when I was looking at different universities and different places of how they have recommended to make sure Excel spreadsheets are accessible, they also recommended that there be a team, again, say the Oregon Commission for the Blind, that's actually designated to be an Excel accessibility team. Because it's -- they are a lot more convoluted than Word documents, et cetera, to make accessible. So it might be helpful to actually put together a team that's interested in just making sure documents are accessible before they're sent out. I guess the final comment on accessibility that I have, is if the agency has already taken all of these steps and knows all these things and that they believe that the documents are accessible and have met check accessibility standards for accessibility, then it might be time, 'cause if the managers are still saying, "We -- we can't get in there, we can't access, we don't understand it," it might be time to pull in the agency staff that are knowledgeable about Excel accessibility and set on it a training so that managers with JAWS, et cetera, can start understanding these spreadsheets. Because finances of anything, whether it's our own homes or our businesses or even the program you're in, is important. And so it's important to understand. It's not just important to the person putting it together, or believe that they have put it together for somebody to understand; it's actually important for the participants to understand. So I would encourage that. I also [inaudible] final of that, is I know that RS -- the legislators, the federal legislators, just put back through a big relief package for the Randolph-Sheppard, and I think that's great. I think it's good news for all of you, and I know there will be discussions as to how you work through that relief that's hopefully coming all your way. But as I read through that relief package, one of the things that was required to get that relief package was RSA, Rehabilitation Services Administration, had to submit like a congressional report. And one of the things that's seemed to keep glowing itself to me as I read the congressional report is, they wanted to know, in a lot of ways, how money is being spent through the Business Enterprise Programs. They seemed to have to share that there was now some mediation processes going on in various states, how they were handling arbitration cases. And so that told me glaringly it's all about money, because those are big ticket items and it means to -- and they're watching how money is spent in the program. And so it's gonna be important as you guys continue to work and refine things with the agency, to continue trying to build those relationships with the agency, and part of that relationship building is making sure you have the information, and you have the information you can understand, and you have the information that's accessible, to understand. So and financials are a big part of that in the BEP program. So that's my spiel on that. And then I do know that Randy put together some questions for Eric. As Randy mentioned, him and I did go through the budget, kind of a cursory review. I guess before we start on that, I actually wanted to touch on the RSA-15 report. I haven't had a chance to go through the entire RSA-15 report, and that's another thing I would encourage: every year, the agency and the BECC, in conjunction with the vendors, make time to go through the report together, and understand what it's actually saying. I know that that's become a big thing, that I think NABM is trying to get more Elected Committee members to understand their RSA-15 reports; again, it's like man -- managing and monitoring your own household. If you're not looking at reports that are driven by the money and how things are being filled in, you really don't know much about your own household as to how you're expending money. And that's the same with whether it's the program reports coming out of the state, it's the same, what's the state's reporting to the feds. And so I just continue to try and encourage RS -- RSA-15 review, and it not just be a submit button from OCB to RSA; that it actually become a conversation piece. And I'll give you a reason why. Here's a good -- here's a good indicator in the RSA-15 that was recently submitted, why I think it needs to be a good conversation piece. So in or -- it -- under item VI, it's called Number of Sites Surveyed, it shows the number of sites surveyed during the reported year: there was one federal, eighteen non-federal properties, for a total of nineteen. Of those nineteen, twelve was accepted by the SLA. And it goes on to explain why there's -- the other seven were not accepted. None of the seven were -- none of the seven -- none of the reasons seven were not accepted was due to lack of qualified vendors. So that's telling me that sites are being denied for whatever reason, but it's not due to qualified vendors. And when this report is about a Business Enterprise Program [inaudible] to blind individuals, I assume due to lack of qualified vendors would be you guys. So it's saying that sites weren't denied because of lack of qualified vendors. So that's telling me, OK, the Commission's saying they have qualified vendors, they're not denying set -- sites because they don't have enough qualified vendors. So then I go up and look at number of sites pending assignment to blind vendors: twelve. So of the twelve accepted by the agency, twelve are pending assignment to blind vendors; however, when I look at number of sites contracted to a third party, those twelve were contracted to a third party. And if I look at previous RSA-15 reports, the same type of data shows up: there's qualified vendors, but for some reason they're not going to the blind vendors, the sites that are accepted; for some reason, they're going to third-party vendors. And therein lies the discussion on that, in my opinion, because that drives right back into the unassigned vending and what's happening with it. The RSA-15 report clearly shows me that the unassigned vending is going out to third-party contractors. Well, the discussion doesn't stop there. The discussion needs to be, why is that, if we're qualified, and we're the ones that have the priority, why is that happening, and what steps do we need to fix that? And I know that's starting to be the conversation that you guys are having, but the conversations need to start resulting in results, meaning locations go out to [inaudible] something happens with those. I know some of the unassigned vending, because it's an odd year with COVID, has been sent out to managers for COVID relief, I believe. So that's understandable as well. But I want to make sure that these reports, such as the RSA-15, start driving the conversations. Because once you're driving it off the data that OCB is submitting to the federal agency, then it's harder and harder to veer off that data. Just keep going back to the data. The data's telling me this. So how do we fix this so next year the data shows that those actually went to blind vendors and not pending assignment. 'Cause I can tell ya, there's quite a few years that all of the locations have been pending assignment to blind vendors. And year after year, pending assignment to blind vendors. And year after year, the locations that have been accepted in the year have gone out to third parties. So that's, when trying to help you understand the data, to start driving your conversations, and take out the personality and let's go back to the figures, and let's understand why this is happening and how we prevent it from happening, and change these -- start changing the -- the look of these reports. I want to see that those went out to blind vendors. I don't want to see that they're pending. I don't want to see that they went to third-party contractors. We need to start shoring up that data to put this program where it's supposed to be with the blind vendors. So hopefully that helps you a little bit on RSA-15 and help to start driving discussions on the data and figures that are supported by what O -- OCB submitted to the feds. And then we can get into, also, the figures that OCB provides to you, because these figures should actually be driving, at some point, the data that goes to RSA-15 in a lot of ways. And one of the things I did notice, and I know Randy sent out...I think there was eight questions. I don't know, Randy, if you want me to walk through what I found and then so that the managers actually --

Hauth: Yeah, if you -- if you -- if -- if you would, briefly, that'd be great.

Haseman: OK. So what I was thinking might be easier for Eric and everybody else if -- if we kinda start with question one, but before we get into the question, for the answer, I want to just walk through what I see, OK? So the vendors can start understanding this report. So on the -- on the report, there's what's called a summary tab at the bottom, and if you open that up, there's a variety of things that are listed there, and it compares last year's quarter to this year -- well, a quarter -- first quarter 2019 to first quarter 20, and so on. Second quarter of 2019 to second quarter --. So that's always a good indicator to look at, how are we doing compared to quart -- and that's just a financial tool that anybody that deals with financials can look at quarter by quarter, year to date versus prior year to date, how to look at things like that. And so when I look at this, I realize we're in COVID 2020, so that tells me our sales should be down...you gotta kinda think through what are the indicators, as you know as businesspeople, what are the things I know that could drive income, what are the things I know that have depleted income, or s -- sidelined my income. And I know COVID 2020 is substantial. So I -- it's not a shock to me when I look and I see total sales are down for the first quarter, significantly down for the second quarter, significantly down for the third quarter...of course, fourth quarter hasn't been reported on here. So that -- that makes sense to me. Total net, again, those should correlate to your total sales. Those all seem to be in line with the total sales. First quarter, not so bad, being down; second quarter, drastically down; third quarter, starting to make a little bit of comeback, but still drastically down from a year ago for that same quarter. Then I look at set-aside invoiced; that all kinda makes sense to me. Then I come to what's called unassigned vending income, and I start to go, "Hmm." Up above, all the other things made sense, that 2020's first quarter was down. But how come unassigned vending income to quarter -- first quarter of 2019 is up? So for January through March of 2020, unassigned vending income was 34,469, compared to a year ago, it was 30,677. Now, everything else above that is down, but unassigned vending income is up in a quarter starting where COVID began. So I'm questioning how unassigned vending went up. Is there new sites that've come in? Was reporting not being done correctly by third-party vendors to the agency? What has happened that's made that go up, when everything else in a year comparison was trending down? Now, second quarter seems to make sense to me. Second quarter unassigned vending income went down compared to the ye -- a year ago. It's 26,881, compared to second quarter of 2019, it was 37,641. So again, I can understand that one. But then I get over to third quarter, and all of a sudden, again, July Sept -- through September of 2020, unassigned vending is 46,553?

[undetermined]: Wow.

Haseman: And a quarter -- the same quarter last year in 2019 was 37,558. Why is there almost a ten thousand dollar -- a nine thousand dollar increase in a COVID year when everything else above is trending down significantly, other than that? So has there been inaccurate reporting in the past in unassigned vending? I mean, it just starts the question flow, right? What's happening? What -- more assignments go out to third party contractors? What's going on? So that's why the question was raised of, it's not hugely significant because second quarter of 2020 was down so much, so it took a lot of that sting out of the 9,000 in the third quarter and the 4,000 in the first quarter being up, but overall, if you take the second quarter, which seems to trend correctly, the question becomes, what happened in first quarter and third quarter, why unassigned vending went up, when everything is trending down. So that was kind of the question to Eric. I don't know that it was formatted exactly that way, but maybe Eric was watching along with that summary spreadsheet, he can see what I'm talking about, and anybody else would. And can answer why that unassigned vending went up.

Morris: Yeah, hang on one second, Linda: I'm trying to figure out why we got the echo doing. Just trying to see --

Haseman: Yeah, I don't know. I can -- I can hear myself way in the future.

Morris: Yeah, hang on one sec. I'm just looking to see if my dashboard thing will let me figure that part of it out. It seems to have quieted down.

Derrick Stevenson: Well, while we got a break, Derrick's -- Derrick's here.

Hauth: Hey Derrick.

Morris: So Linda, thank you for the review. I think that's a great way to tee up the report. And...you know, the -- the accessibility parts of the Excel spreadsheets, you're right, it is a complicated set of data that I send out each month that we've kind of built over time. So if there's -- if there's data or formatting in here that people want to see in a different way, shape, or form, we just need to have a conversation about that. 'Cause I -- I build the -- I personally build this report every quarter so that we can check all the things that people have asked about. So I -- I think that's important to have that conversation. Especially, you know, the accessibility part of it, of course, but more importantly the understanding of it. 'Cause I think a lot of times, people have asked for data, they're like, "We want *this* data," and I, quite frankly, I'm not sure if everybody always understood what they were asking for and, you know, the format it came in. So if there's a way to change that to make it more, you know, readable and understandable, that's definitely something we can do. I'm just -- I'm getting a lot of cross-talk noise, so I'm trying to figure out how I can fix that. That's better. I didn't go back and look at the whole year; you're right, Linda, I looked at that in the first quarter, you know, we saw kind of an uptick in the first quarter when things were kind of normal still when it comes to unassigned vending. Then we saw the downward trend. For the third quarter, it was predominantly, the best I could tell, really associated with the unassigned vending due to rest areas. Because as we went into the summertime, you guys will probably remember, and it seems like a long time ago, during the summertime, but a lot of Americans were out on the roads and accessing vending at the roadside rest areas, 'cause there wasn't a lot of other things they could access. So that was one of the few assignable causes I could figure out to say, hey, this is why it's trending so much higher be -- was because of that travel season, which is July, August, and September. So that's what I attributed it to.

Haseman: And so, then, that -- just so everybody understands, so that expl -- tells me that there's -- there's...third-party vendors in rest areas. And so I go to the RSA-15 report, and I see that there are five locations operated by third-party contractors, and in looking at the RSA-15 report, there's 27 locations operated by blind vendors. And there was a total vending machine receipts for the blind vendors in those locations of 46,793 on the RSA-15, and that's, again, 27 locations to the blind vendors. The five locations done by the third-party contractors, they had 21,654 in receipts. So I guess my question is, those five sites, and -- and you don't have to answer it right now, Eric; I'm just saying how I would then question and query. 'Cause my next question would be, those five sites can bring in 21,000, versus 27 sites bringing in 46,000, must be pretty lucrative. And why aren't those being looked at to go to blind vendors or pulled into a route or something? So --

Hauth: Hey. Hey Li -- Li -- Linda? Linda and Eric? I think this is excellent information. I know we have some more questions that we have to go through, so if we -- I think we've made, you know, we've made this aware. And you've done a great job at doing that, but I think if we can kinda just step through the other questions so we can get the answers to it, and then we can get on to the other business. One thing that, while listening to you guys, I think it'd be really good, Eric, every quarter, when you send -- when you send these out, just also send, like, an unassigned vending spreadsheet out that could maybe identify if there's new locations or, you know, I'm -- if that's, you know, just something I'm thinking here. But Linda, if you could go through the next questions, so we can get those done, that'd be great.

Haseman: Sure. Sure, but I --

Art Stevenson: Mr. Chair?

Hauth: Yes, Art?

Art Stevenson: OK. While we're going through -- this is all good, but I -- I wanted to -- Linda was talking about all this stuff and said last year there were...how many surveys done, Linda?

Haseman: There was...let me find my data again. There was one on federal and nine on -- or, I'm sorry. One on federal and eighteen on non-federal properties, for a total of nineteen.

Art Stevenson: OK. Well, and Mr. Chair, I just wanted to state, you know, I know the Elected Committee had asked to see any surveys that were done, which would be classified as program-relevant information, and I do not remember members of the Elected Committee receiving one survey, and so I just wanted to reiterate, or even make a motion, because I feel this is program-relevant information, and we should be provided that information; in fact, it's required by the federal law, and so, I do not remember receiving any surveys, and so I would like to reiterate that, as a member of the Elected Committee. And I believe all of the other members of the Elected Committee would like to ensure that we're receiving this program rel -- relevant information. And so I don't know if we want to entertain another motion, or just note for the record --

Hauth: Well, Art? Art? Let me -- let me, if I may, Art, I don't mean -- I'm sorry to interrupt you, what I'd like to suggest, and you can think about it, obviously: Eric has already said, lookit, if there's things that we need to do to this report so you can actually acc -- access it, you know, and understand it, and maybe we need to formulate some re -- you know, recommendations to go forward to the agency saying, lookit, we need -- we need this broken out so we can understand it. We need this to be accessible so we -- you know. And maybe what you're talking about as far as quarterly, maybe we could be provided the surveys, and...I mean, just my thought. You can do whatever, you know --

Art Stevenson: Well -- well -- well, Randy, I'm just pointing out, OK, that -- and -- and I know this to be true, that we've requested in the past to be receiving program-relevant information, and I know we have requested to receive surveys done, and, correct me if I'm wrong, I don't remember receiving one survey that was done last year. And -- and so I just wanted to point out for the record that, you know, this is something that we have wanted, but not received. And so I just wanted to put that on the record right at this point in time, you know, obviously it's -- it's a piece of the puzzle, so we actually, "we" being the Elected Committee, know what's going on in our program. So anyways, I'll be quiet now, and --

Hauth: I agree. I agree, Art. I agree.

Art Stevenson: -- and -- and, you know, I really appreciate Linda's report here, and I may have something else to say, but I just wanted to note this for the record. So I'm going back on mute.

Hauth: OK, thank you. You bet, bud. Let's roll on. Linda?  
Haseman: OK. The next tab at the bottom of the report is called "budget to actual." And this is actually a really good report because it shows what was legisly -- legislatively adopted for the 2019 - 2021 budget cycle. And then it does a comparison of what the expenditures and projected expenditures are going to be. And so between a variety of columns, really the key column, in my opinion, on this one, is towards the end, under what's called the column [inaudible] X right now on this particular spreadsheet, is called variance to LAB, because it gives you an idea for any particular line item on here, what the legislators approved versus what the expenditures and project -- projected expenditures through this budget [inaudible] are to be. And it shows you when the agency's gonna go over, and it shows you when the agency's gonna have excess money in particular categories. And then, what the bottom line's gonna be, at the end -- as an end result. So just to take an example for you, if I look at personal services at 3110, class -- under classified salary and per diem, the legislatively -- the adopted budget was 657,120 for that particular category. The expenditures from July '19 through October '20 were a hun -- 412,249. So 412,249 have been expended of the 657,120 budgeted. The remainder projected to be expended through the rest of the budget cycle, through June 30th, is 214,384. And right now, the agency's projected that they're gonna have some money left over from that. However the agency -- about 30,487 is projected to not be expended in that classification. So I don't know if the agency's using -- and there's other things on here that show that they're gonna expend the amount legislative approved. And so this would always be a question down the road, is that something that, I know that at one point, I heard 91,000 was coming out of unassigned vending. Well, if the agency's projected not to expend all of the personnel budget that was legislatively approved, if -- if that's being expended somewhere else in the budget, you guys need to understand that. If not, maybe the 91,000 should go to, you know, they should take it out of here and offset the 91,000 that should've came out of unassigned. Again, just a -- just another example. So the next one is facility profit, and I think Randy recently told me that this is going away. Is that correct, Eric? Are you gonna get rid of this facility profit [inaudible]?

Morris: Yeah, hang on one second, Linda. Somebody -- somebody's stomping around off mute, which I -- I apologize. I'm not -- it's hard for me to monitor the Zoom call and mute people. Yeah, so the -- the note that I sent back to Randy and -- and the group about, so we're changing from the, you probably heard the term System 7, which is our case management system that we use to basically put in data to generate like our RSA-15 report, that system's going away, and we're gonna go to a new system made by a different company, and the new product is called Aware. And so, as we're -- and that's been taking up a ton of our time recently as we get ready to transition to that. But the new system does not have the same analytics at this point to provide that kind of data, which I was, to be perfectly honest, severely disappointed, 'cause I -- I, like you, I like to be able to look at the numbers and see what's going on, and so we're hoping to get some better analytics in the future, like late this -- late this spring, maybe in the summertime, but there's no guarantees around that, 'cause it's a separate procurement process that --. I -- I don't have any ties to the...you know, there's a whole separate team that's working on this Alliance Aware project, but I've requested that so we can provide that information and pull it out. Because, you know, System 7, like, I think one of the questions is, why is it calculating like a thousand percent loss? It's not a great system for, like, analyzing profitability. You gotta really strip it out and put it into an Excel spreadsheet and kinda, you know, massage it a little bit to get the data you want. But right now, with the Aware system, I can't even pull it out and strip it down into an Excel spreadsheet, 'cause it's just the way it's set. So some of those kinda things, like that one, is -- it's not gonna be possible, at least in the near future, to do that.

Haseman: OK. 'Cause what I was gonna say, is if this continued, it's a great tool, in my opinion, for the Elected Committee and the agency to see managers that may be needing assistance, may be needing some additional shoring up, if they're -- granted, COVID is a whole different ball game, but in previous years, it could tell the -- the managements -- management team as well as the BECC, hey, do we need to kinda help shore that person up, and maybe work collaboratively to do that. So I saw this as trying to encourage support, and so, hopefully there might be another tool that could do that. The same occurs to me with manager -- managing -- the next tab is manager income ranking, and this kinda shows, oh, I don't know, for about a year lookback period in a couple of columns, the individuals from number one ranking to the bottom. And again, there's a variety of factors I know that goes [inaudible] business, but this, in my opinion, looking at something like this can help the BECC work with the agency to say, hey, let's look at maybe the bottom one. I know that there's also fair minimum return. Can -- can we extract some information? If you're giving us a low manager ranking, how can we use that to work on fair minimum return? Because something's gotta be driving this ranking; I assume it's data; that data should be used to be able to shore those managers up or bring them some form of minimum return. So again, that's another useful tool to both the agency and the BECC, to take out the personality and let's start driving conversations with the data and these -- and figures. The next one after that is the AG fee, and I don't remember, but there's -- I think this is key, because as I started out the conversation with, if you read through that congre -- congressional report that recently drove money out to soon, hopefully, out to help the BEP managers, they were really kinda trying to figure out what was going on in arbitrations, and what's going on with conflict resolutions, and -- and when I look at this, and there's still nine more months to capture in the -- in the given budget period, you're already 161,000 out to AG costs. Anytime you guys can resolve problems together, and less attorneys are involved and more dialogue, I think that that's good. And so I think this could become a useful tool to the agency and the manager. Let's really work on getting this AG cost down, and why -- let's go through this and see why there's AG costs. And let's see if we can maybe -- what -- what should our goal be? And let's look at that each month together, or each quarter together, and where are we doing with our whole -- with AG costs? So just another good way to drive conversations, again, using your data -- using data to do that. The next one after that is the set-aside balance sheet, and --

Hauth: Hey, Lin -- Linda?

Haseman: Yeah?

Hauth: Linda, I wanted to ask you -- I wanted to ask a question. So on that, what questions was that, on the AG? Was that question three, or...?

Haseman: Um...

Hauth: Is that -- do you know?

Haseman: OK.

Hauth: Were you going through the questions, or were you just --

Haseman: Oh, yeah, yeah. So number --.

Hauth: OK.

Haseman: -- yeah, because we talked about the BE being ta -- one thing being taken off the report. So the next one is, what funds are being used to pay for AG fees in consideration of VFM complaints and BECC meeting review?

Morris: So, I -- I checked in with Accounting on that, 'cause I wanted to be specific. Twenty-nine percent of AG fees are being paid out of state funds; one percent of other funds; and seventy percent of federal funds, is what I was told.

Hauth: OK. Was there another question on there, Linda?

Haseman: Tied to the AG stuff? No --

Hauth: Yeah, I think the -- one of the --

Haseman: I -- I guess what I had thought through and what I have bolded in red to question, was, for instance, I've seen that quite a bit of money's being expended on B -- through the AG on BECC meetings. I never have heard her come on to BECC meetings. So is that her listening to the BECC meetings? And if so, what is she listening for, and she maybe should be coming and talking to you guys about what she's listening to, so you guys can understand why all these expenses are showing up for BECC meetings and start driving down those costs. Because I see, boy, three, four, five, six --

Hauth: Yeah. Yeah, let me -- let me make a --

Haseman: -- thousand -- ten thousand dollars in BECC meetings.

Hauth: Yeah. Let me -- let me make a comment here and a question. I know we've raised it before, but Eric, is -- so it's my understanding, and, you know, maybe the agency doesn't understand it that way, but really the only way that the agency can use money to litigate against a manager or to, you know, address a complaint, is through state-appropriated funds. You're not supposed to use any set-aside funds. And, my understanding, they're not supposed to use federal matching funds. You know, if I'm right or wrong on that, that's what I've been told by people who should know and who have worked at RSA. And so when I look at -- when I look at the AG coming on and reviewing our meetings, and like Linda said, to an amount of ten thousand dollars, I'm wondering what that is. Why -- why does the agency feel they need our AG to review the meetings, and if it's not like, you know, to review for, you know, like legal matters or complaint matters or to, you know, find a gotcha kinda moment, then that should be shared openly and freely with the agency. And so I'm not sure what you're hearing, you know, as far as that, or what you can share, but it is a concern, I know.

Morris: Yeah, Randy, I understand that. I -- the piece you talked about, the fund -- the financing of stuff, like state funds, federal funds, and stuff, I -- I'm not sure that's accurate. So I'll just leave it at that. I -- I just -- I haven't seen that anywhere. I -- I know there's lots of chatter about that on different, you know, big Zoom meetings across the country, but...I -- I don't think that's accurate.

Hauth: Can -- can you -- can you tell us, like, are you free to tell us why the AG is being paid out of set-aside to review our meetings?

Morris: Well, the -- the AG -- what -- the set-aside account, just -- just to step back a little bit from that, the set-aside account doesn't generate enough money to pay our AG bill in any way, shape, or form. So to say that the AG is reviewing our meetings using set-aside is not accurate. State funds, federal funds, and one percent of other, which I'm not quite sure what that's being generated from, is what's paying the bill. Not set-aside. So...that's -- that's about as far as I'm going to talk about the AG and that stuff.

Hauth: OK. Well, thank you. I know -- you know, I --. Yeah. Thank you for at least addressing it. I don't know that we really got any more clarity. And I know this is something we'll continue to, you know, address. I just don't think it's a very -- I don't know of other agencies across the land that do that, Eric, and I just don't, you know, don't think it's a very trusting way to actively participate with the Elected Committee. Like Linda was saying, you know, if the -- if Gretchen Merrill has a concern, the agency has a concern that deals -- they need to pay her to review the meeting, then how about make her an actual live person during a meeting, especially if she's supposed to also represent the Elected Committee, which we continue to be provided. So that's maybe something to think about going forward. Anyway, so, what do we have on question four, Linda?

Art Stevenson:Hey, Randy? Randy? Just a quick --

Hauth: Go ahead, Art. Go ahead, Art. Go ahead, Art.

Art Stevenson: Sorry to jump in there, but, you know, I heard Eric say, you know, that the computer system, you know, correct me if I'm wrong here, Eric, you know, the system is more difficult for you to use, or you're not getting any input on your needs as the director of, you know, the Business Enterprise Program, and I -- I -- I mean, I -- I wanna understand what's going on here, 'cause obviously we want a computer system that, you know, is also helpful to the director of the vending program and stuff, and so, is this, you know, let -- let me understand that a little bit better, because as a member of the Elected Committee, I want to make sure that the money that the agency is spending to buy a computer system is also usable and helpful for the vending program, and we're being considered, you know, as -- as they purchase this thing, and all the stuff is added to, you know, help -- help our program, also. 'Cause I believe that computer system does need those kinda things in it.

Morris: Yeah, Art -- Art, it's a great -- great question, and I should've filled that in a little deeper when we were talking about it a few minutes ago. So the Aware product, which is -- Alliance is the company; they make the Aware case management system. It's used all across the country -- all across the country on the VR side. So they have a huge depth of knowledge around the VR problem. I'm gonna mute whoever's on that got the dog going...if I can find it real quick. OK. So, but the -- they're -- they're young in the process of using the -- the Business Enterprise, Randolph-Sheppard module of the Aware system. So they've got, I believe it's five other states, using it right now. And they've -- they've highly customized it for a couple of states, which costs a huge amount of money, to do any customization. But, so essentially, what we did is we bought an off-the-shelf program to use for our state, which is good in the sense that it saves us quite a bit of money getting the newer product, which, the newer product is, just from a -- a practicality standpoint, much easier to navigate, it's all web-based, you can run it anywhere you want to run it. But when you get into the details of it, how other states have analyzed their data and what they really focus on, it's lacking on the reporting side. So what -- what you have to do is you have to purchase an additional analytics tool to mine the data out. And it sounds like we'll probably be able to get that tool, but just not right away, like in the first three or four months. We're hoping to go live with this product at the end of February. So those deeper dive analytics won't be available right away, but I've definitely gotten support for getting the tools we need. It's definitely gonna help us track, you know, just in an easier, more accessible way to navigate versus the System 7 product, which only uses Internet Explorer, is only available through that -- that -- that web browser, which, for anybody that does a lot of surfing on the web, I don't know anybody that uses Internet Explorer anymore, so it's just not as helpful to have that kinda thing, so.

Hauth: Hey, Er -- Eric and Art, thank you for that, and, I mean, obviously, that's something we're gonna have to continue to look at, but if we can move forward and get the rest of these answers, questions asked and answered, and just try and go through it as speedily as we can so we can get on to the rest, that'd be great.

Haseman: OK. It's Linda again. I'm just gonna make one comment on the AG fees before I move into the set-aside balance sheet, and I guess, in my opinion, it's kind of an unorthodox way to have a -- I've never heard of it before, where the attorney who's also supposed to be overseeing a public body, which you guys are, is covertly being paid, it looks, to listen to your guys's meetings, but not bringing anything forward if there's concerns. So to me, this seems like a lot of money wasted. If there's concerns, bring 'em forward; let the BECC understand it and work through it. Otherwise, it's just money, in my opinion, that doesn't seem logical and seems unreasonable, or not really prudently spent. OK. Moving on to set-aside balance. The past due set-aside balance, so, first quarter and second quarter in this particular spreadsheet are blank. I do think, though, that some people probably did pay set-aside first quarter and second quarter, but those are blank. And then third quarter shows up at 61,433, so I -- I'm assuming that's a compilation of everything that would've happened up until third quarter. And then it's showing past due balance of 21,416. I guess the question on that became, OK, is the 21,416 from -- [phone ringing] -- I'll let somebody get that, I guess.

Art Stevenson: Hello?

Hauth: Art, you're off mute.

Haseman: OK. So is the 21,416 part of that agreement that the agency and the vendor -- the vendor committee made to allow people to not pay, I think it's, again, a moving target; I think the newest one is maybe March of -- of this year. Or is that still -- or is that now showing the delinquent and liquidated debt that's been reported to the legislators every year for quite some time? And if it's not the delinquent and liquidated debt that's still tied to the program, where does that show up in the financials? So those are the questions.

Morris: So the -- the 21,416 was the deferred amount of set-aside that's tracking over six -- over sixty days, I believe? So that's -- that's what that amount is, Linda.

Haseman: OK. And, Eric, I don't think that was a question I had thought about when Randy and I were putting together the questions, but do you know what -- where that delin -- delinquent and liquidated debt is that's reported to the legislators, and do you know why it's not being tracked somewhere for the Business -- for the Elected Committee to see? And keep -- keep aware of?

Morris: I -- I don't, Linda. And I don't -- I don't know if anybody's ever asked us to put that on the quarterly report.

Haseman: OK. So that might be an ask that we could encourage Randy and others to do, because I don't want that to be forgot out there, 'cause it's not forgot. The legislators get a report about it, and so I think it's important for the Committee to keep it knowledgeable and for OCB to keep aware of, as well, so. OK. Moving to the next one, is the set-aside year to date. And I don't think I really saw anything that jumped out at me. There was a large purchase of equipment in January of 2020. I assume that was gearing up for running the vending program, so vendors are gonna go out and start filling their own; however, I know COVID got that sideways a little bit for a while. There was also [inaudible] vacation payout, so, you know, nothing really stood out on these. There -- there was another re -- there -- for me, as far as this for the Elected Committee, this is a good way for them to see exactly how money's being expended. For instance, there was a refurbish of facilities, and how the funds are being used, it was paid by other federal 110 monies. And that was 28,000 dollars in February. So this is a good way for maybe the Elected Committee to pick out pockets and say, wait a second, what was that money expended for? You know...just using other --

Hauth: Just to let -- just to let everybody know, we're after four o'clock, so I don't know if we have --

Haseman: [inaudible]

Hauth: Well, don't we have five, six, seven, eight quest -- don't we have questions for him?

Haseman: Well, we've been --

Hauth: Four more questions?

Haseman: -- we've been -- we've been going through 'em. Let me look.

Hauth: Well, the questions were about Smitty's, and the questions were about some other things that --

Haseman: Right, that's the last tab.

Hauth: OK.

Haseman: Yeah. That's the last tab.

Hauth: OK. Go ahead. Go ahead.

Haseman: OK. So moving to this last tab, it's called set-aside details, and again, this is where...so, the set-aside year to date just is an overview, and this is one where it actually gives you the detail of how and -- the amount and who it was expended to. And the first question to -- to Eric on this, and I think these are all good tools, again, for the Elected Committee to look at, is, what are the Smitty's management services? And I think these were flip-flopped. I don't know that management services total 10,000; I come up with 9,000. So what are the Smitty's management services of 10,000 that show up on this report? What one is Smitty's doing for -- and it looks like a consistent payment of 3,000 dollars.

Morris: That's -- that's correct, Linda. That's storage of our vending machines. We have a hundred plus vending machines in storage as part of the self-service rollout. So that's what that's attributed to.

Haseman: And then the other question that I think, when I was going through this with Randy, that would be important for like the BECC to understand and know and look at in the future, is maintenance of equipment of nine thousand -- that might actually be ten thousand -- for Smitty's. I think the question that we had is we -- when we looked over that RFP that went out tied -- that Smitty's ended up getting, tied to the vending machines, they had a responsibility for -- or a set period of time to manage that equipment, or maintain that equipment, I should say. So has some of that equipment come -- has some of that expired, and now that's having to be paid out to them?

Morris: Yeah, we've -- we've had some equipment that needs to be...maintenanced under -- that's under warranty, and some that's not. And...gosh, I'm just trying to fix the audio, I'm sorry. So some of it has been paid to Smitty's to repair equipment that's out of warranty, and then we've been paying Smitty's to, like, move some equipment and do some other maintenance type of things like that, over the course of the year.

Haseman: OK. And then I think our last question, it was on -- it was back to the -- and this should be fairly quick, too -- it was back to the budget to actual tab. The second -- the column over, the fourth column over, titled D, it says SB5723, so Senate Bill 5723, summer 2020 special session, and when I scroll down through there, there's actually money that came through for general funds, and also it looks like federal funds, but neither Randy nor I could recall a Senate Bill 5723 for the summer 2020; I looked it up: it looked like the kinda all-inclusive, roll-in-anything-you-can omnius bud or omnius bill or whatever it's called --

Morris: Om -- omni --

Haseman: -- but can you explain that?

Morris: Yeah. It's an omnibus bill, is, I think that's how you pronounce it. And basically what happened, the way it's been explained to me is we got -- we didn't get a whole bunch more money; I think there was a little bit of monies that came in that were left out of the budget from beforehand that were somehow not applied to our original budget, but basically what it does, is it gives us the spending authority to carry forward the vending machine project, is -- was the -- the vast amount of work around Senate Bill 5723 for us, so.

Haseman: OK. I think that's where I leave off, Randy. That was the last tab and the last question. And...

Hauth: Well --

Haseman: I guess it's up to the --

Hauth: Well --

Haseman: -- Elected Committee now, but thank you very much, and I appreciate everybody's time, and good luck to you all, and stay well and safe.

Morris: Thanks Linda.

[undetermined]: Thanks Linda.

Hauth: OK, Linda, thanks so much. Thanks so much, Linda. Linda did a lot of work and she prepared a lot and she's pretty knowledgeable on this. I mean, it's a -- it's a shame that the Elected Committee, who is stewarded with actively participating in major administrative decisions and program policy matters, as we all know, can't actually access the forms that come out. You know, there's -- there -- as we all know, there's various levels of vision within the agency: there's full-sighted administrators, board members; there's partially-sighted administrators and counselors; and then there's totally blind persons. You know, the concern, and I -- I've experienced it firsthand, the agency sometimes seems to lose track of what everybody's going to need. I trust Lewanda knows very well how to use a screen reader; think she's very tech-savvy, as well as some of you others are. With my limited vision, you know, I can kinda scroll through different things. But bottom line, it's not right that we get information that we can't access, and now I think we have a commitment from Eric to say, hey, lookit, we'll understand and we'll work to make this form accessible or...and/or so you understand the information that's in it, right? So let's find out how we do that, and Eric, feel free to come up with some ideas on your own, too. I think there's some columns that are much more interesting -- of interest to the Elected Committee, like the unassigned vending or the set-aside expenditures, right? I think we need to be able to as -- access those and [inaudible]. I'll just say on a side note, too, when I talk to people to say, how'd you fill in your time tracker? Oh, well, I had to have my husband or my wife or my employee do it. That's not right, either, and I think that was identified as an accessibility issue by the legal firm out of Illinois, Chicago. And so that's something that we need to -- really need to work on. As far as unassigned vending, I could tell you, you know, for you [inaudible] know or don't know, there is currently a action pending through the Office of Administrative Hearing that will be moving forward that deals with that and addresses that, what is contended to be a violation. I also understand that RSA will be [inaudible] much like they did the active participation technical assistant directive, they're going to now be dealing with unassigned vending and how agencies handle and deal with unassigned vending. And so that's -- that's really good, but bottom line, let's work and get this resolved and, you know, move -- move on, and -- and try and, you know, help have a successful, vibrant program, so. OK, thanks again, Linda. What do we have next on the -- and we -- we'll definitely have Linda back, so. What do we have next on the agenda?  
Jaynes: Next item on the agenda under new business is adopt RSA "active participation” memorandum.

Hauth: OK, so, anyway, you know, I'm on a national chat line with other chairs, and Art is as well, and I also communicate with others across the land, and hopefully you've all seen the technical assistance that's been issued from Rehabilitative Services Administration that clearly identifies, you know, to the best of its ability, what active participation is supposed to look like, what it means. It's clearly not advisory. The elected committees are supposed to have meaningful -- I know we once heard, oh, "meaningful" doesn't mean -- "meaningful," it doesn't say it. Well, you know, the guidance now clearly identified that we as elected committee members are supposed to have a meaningful role in participation, and it's not simply just to listen to -- we're not simply advisory. So that was -- that was good stuff. It does say the agency is the ultimate authority; however, the agency can't just rule a...mallet and dismiss all the other intended pathways, so they can't just say, "Nope, we say this, and that's how it goes," you know, so, it's laying it out on the table, it's opening it up for conversation. I think here in Oregon, we have a long, long way to go, but it doesn't mean we can't get there. I wanted to propose to the Board that the active participation technical assistant directive be adopted as a guiding, you know, guiding light for us. If there's any discussion around that, that's great; or, if you want to entertain a motion to get that on the books, you know, it sure wouldn't hurt anything, so. Any discussion or any motions? Art, you're on mute. I know you're trying to talk. Well, I think you're trying to talk. Are you there, Art? Is he on -- is he muted, Eric, by chance?

Morris: I'm trying to look, Randy. Do you know -- do you know what his --? Everybody's on the phone, so I gotta look at phone numbers.

Jackson: You can't -- you can't make the motion yourself, Randy?

Hauth: He's five-oh -- well, I want Art to be on it. 501, I think it's 503-510...or 501, or...it's a 585 number.

Morris: OK. Hang on. I'm look -- I'm looking. Trying to --

Miranda: 510-1193.

Morris: I don't -- I don't know if I see --

Hauth: 510-1193?

Morris: I don't think I see him on here.

[undetermined]: Oh, Art?

Hauth: OK, well, anyway...

Morris: Yeah, he may --

Hauth: We still have a quorum on, we have Lin, Lewan --

Jackson: [inaudible] start talking.

Miranda: I'll make a motion.

Hauth: Yeah, I'd like a--. OK, go ahead.

Miranda: I'll make a motion that we adopt the Randolph-Sheppard active participation definition memorandum.

Hauth: OK. So a motion's been made.

Jackson: Second.

Hauth: OK.

Jaynes: I second.

Hauth: A second. OK. Any discussion? OK, hearing no discussion, yea or nay vote. Lewanda Miranda?

Miranda: Yea.

Hauth: Derrick Stevenson? Lin Jaynes?

Jaynes: Yea.

Hauth: Lewan --. Steve Jackson?

Jackson: Yes.

Hauth: And I'll vote yes as well.

Art Stevenson: [inaudible] I'm back.

Hauth: Art? That's alright, buddy.

Art Stevenson: Yeah, can you repeat the motion?

Hauth: Sure, we -- sure we can. We're -- Lewanda made [inaudible] --

Art Stevenson: [inaudible] memorandum?

Hauth: Yep. Yep.

Miranda: Yes.

Art Stevenson: OK, I vote yes.

Hauth: So we're going -- we're -- we're going through a vote. There's been a motion and a second. Steve Jackson?

Jackson: Yes.

Hauth: Art Stevenson?

Art Stevenson: Yes.

Hauth: And I'll vote yes as well, so that motion passes. What do we have next on the agenda, Lin?

Jaynes: Next is agency requirement in responding to motions.

Hauth: OK, so I don't have the statute in front of me. I don't know, Eric, if you have it on your laptop or tablet, but I believe it's ORS 346-540 that identifies the agency's responsibility to provide a response to the Elected Committee's motions, that if in fact they deny the Elected Committee's motions, that they'll provide the reason why the denial is in benefit of the...of the program. And, you know, to the best of my recollection, I don't think that that occurs. So I'm wondering what your take on that is, why, you know, why it hasn't been occurring, what we can do to rectify that, or, you know, if, I mean, whatever your position is on that.

Morris: Well, Randy, I think it has been occurring.

Hauth: It's -- it has been occurring? So you -- the agency's identified when they deny a motion, how it benefits the program?

Morris: Yeah.

Hauth: OK. Well, I'll double -- I'll double-check on that. And if I -- if I am wrong, I -- I didn't happen to notice it, but if I'm wrong, I'll get back with ya on that.

Morris: Alright. Thank you.

Hauth: Yep. OK, what do we have next on the agenda?

Jaynes: Next is COVID relief allocated by Congress.

Hauth: OK. COVID relief. I know we saw, you know, again, I -- as many of us are on these different trainings, this has been, obviously, the hot topic...recently. And NABM, NFB, and I think other consumer groups as well, were very -- very helpful in getting this through Congress, and I know, hats off to Nicky Gacos and Terry Smith and others, all of the vendors and managers across the land that pushed in and supported this, but bottom line, there's been twenty million allocated in the COVID relief at this point in time. They've identified 11,000 per manager per state, is how they did it. And using that as a calculator. And that money, as I understand it, is only supposed to go to managers who are impacted by COVID relief, which I re -- honestly, I -- I know one manager that hasn't been identified, or, hasn't been impacted by COVID relief. I know Eric sent out a note last week and said, you know, it doesn't mean that 11,000 does to each manager, but it doesn't mean that that doesn't occur, either. Clearly, if RSA calculated the 11,000 dollars per manager per state was how they formulated this relief, clearly there's some message behind that, a meaning behind that, and it can happen. I think that's probably the clearest and most uniform way. We're still gonna have to wait for RSA to issue its guidelines. The agency does not have access to the money, should not have access to the money. It can't go back to being replenished to pay for COVID relief that managers received, as I understand it. If there's money left over, like if a committee says, gosh, we only want 10,999, and we want one dollar out of each of it to go to set-aside, I think that can happen. Again, we're gonna have to watch for RSA's guidance. But what I'm hearing and what I'm seeing is, the fair way to do it would be to distribute the 11,000 dollars to each manager. You know, some managers maybe have been -- been hurt more than others; I don't know. But everybody, again, has been hurt. And in business, when you're in the Business as a -- Business Enterprise Program, you know, some managers are more profitable, some are less profitable. It's just the way that it -- it goes. One of the things that I did want to mention, also, is as we work with the agency on this, we've got, you know, it doesn't sound like it's gonna be until May or June that these monies -- we want to make sure that any outstanding set-aside -- you know, as we've worked forward with the proposal, we want to make sure that any outstanding set-aside gets paid back before any manager, you know, as part of that whole scenario, so we don't want a manager -- well, I don't want; I mean, I'm thinking out loud, but I don't want a manager to receive 11,000 dollars and also have, you know, a 5,000 dollar set-aside bill and, you know, take -- take the money and run, per se. But, again, there's some unknowns here; the -- the actual known is that this money is dedicated toward managers and...RSA will be seeking -- sending out guidance. So is there anybody else on here that wanted to -- wanted to share their thoughts or suggestions on putting together some kind of proposal? So I'll ask the Elected Committee first, and then I'll also ask Eric, you know, if he's had a chance to think about it, or. Anybody on the Elected Committee have an idea how we kind of formulate a plan?

Jaynes: I -- I wanted to -- to make an observation on what -- on -- on what you said about the past due set-aside. I think that's something that should just be understood and/or motioned. I know it's too early to make a motion, but down the road, after we hear from RSA and how it's gonna formulate, I think that making a motion at that point in time to where the set-aside would be caught up, would be the only fair way to do it.

Hauth: Thank you, Lin. Anyone else? Well, like Lin said, we're still a little bit premature, but Eric, so what do you -- you know, I don't know if you've had much chance to think about this. I know there is a training, going to be an updated training...I think NABM has provided some insight -- further insight on this. But the floor is --

Morris: Yeah, Randy --

Hauth: The floor is yours if you have thoughts on this, as well.

Morris: Yeah, just to k --

Hauth: Clearly, we have to work together with -- with the agency, but I wouldn't know what position the agency would have to try and say, you know, no. I mean, if we -- if we get a majority, you know, of the managers saying, hey, this money is for us, and this is how we believe it should go, I would hope the agency wouldn't take a stance in trying to oppose that, but, you know.

Morris: Well, and I think -- I --

Hauth: Go ahead, Eric.

Morris: Randy, I think the federal bill talks -- what little I've -- one section I was able to read that's actually in there relevant to it, talks about this going directly to the managers to replace losses of revenue. So I think that's the one thing in the discussions I've had with people, is that it's, you know, everybody's kind of trying to figure out their own -- how they think it's gonna happen. And I think the -- the language of the bill's pretty specific that it's for losses of revenue for people who are in the program. So...and the other piece that I -- I saw that I -- I definitely want to see it from RSA, is there's also been talk about, if people have been receiving benefits or, you know, relief payments from other -- other sources, then those would offset any payments that are coming -- so, the 11,000 dollar figure is just -- I -- I think what they did is they took twenty million and divided it out amongst how many people were on the RSA-15 report in 2019. So that's going to equate to about 165,000 dollars for us, if I -- if I did the math right. So, you know, obviously our program probably took a bigger -- I think, just doing the numbers off my head, probably took a bigger revenue hit than that, so, you know, I -- I -- I know everybody wants to problem-solve it, but --

Hauth: Yeah, I would -- I would --. Yeah. And I would think so, too, Eric, think -- thinking back to March of two thousand and whatever it was...twenty, clearly, every manager that I know has lost, regardless if they've gotten unemployment or PPP loans, even above and beyond that, they've lost greater than 11,000 dollars. My understanding is, they didn't want to give money to somebody to actually make them, you know, if they weren't impacted at all, to make them actually make more money than they would've made. That's my understanding. But let's continue to work through it and, you know, learn more about it and, again, I hope the agency, if the managers come to the agency with a plan and the majority of the managers out there are supporting it, I would sure hope that the agency wouldn't try and, you know, take a -- take a heavy-handed approach and say, no, that doesn't -- we don't like that, or whatever, you know, so. Anyway, we'll see. But thank you. Thanks, Eric. So.

Morris: You're welcome.

Hauth: Anybody else on that? OK, what do we have next?

Jaynes: Next on the agenda is COVID relief from set-aside and unassigned vending.

Hauth: OK. I don't know who put that on there, if...do you re -- Lewanda or Art, is that anything, you know, I know that we just received the check, and I think going forward there was a plan on how to kinda calculate the unassigned vending and have that maybe distributed quarterly to managers while we're working through all this, but does anybody have anything to say on this, or Eric, do you have any follow-up on...on how that might look, or how long that would last, you know?

Morris: I -- I can talk just a little bit about it, Randy, if you want.

Hauth: Sure.

Morris: Yeah, like, I think -- I think -- I think you're probably in the same boat I -- as I am right at this point: I'm like, I thought we kinda talked about this on email already, but the way I see it happening, I -- I know the Elected Committee would like a fixed amount going forward every month, but part of the problem is, is that, you know, we can't -- we can't pay out monies out of the budget we don't -- we don't have yet. So just like with the federal unassigned vending, on a quarterly basis, it makes the most sense for me just to, as we get into like March, to look -- or, January, February, March -- into April, to look back at those three months and say, hey, this is what came in from unassigned vending, this is the amount of money we don't have that ha -- that's available to pay out, that's unencumbered. And then do just like we just did, and issue checks alongside with the federal unassigned vacation pay. And I think that gives us a better idea of, you know, what money's actually available within the budget from unassigned vending, and doesn't, you know, get us out of whack with the budget and stuff like that.

Hauth: OK. And I know it's something we'll talk about, but what I will say, I do appreciate, and I think others do, not that it -- not that it has, you know, been a game-changer, but I do appreciate the agency providing COVID relief, even though if it's, you know, I -- I guess we could say, "Well, yeah, that's our money, and we paid into set-aside," but bottom line, the agency worked with us on this, so that's a good thing. And have seemed, you know, to want to work further on this. You know, the landscape, everything I'm hearing, the landscape's gonna look a lot different going forward. So just because the vaccine comes out, and just because people start to reopen businesses and that, I mean, GSA is saying, you know, their people are working at home. And there's going to be probably in the average building, where there used to 100% occupancy, there's gonna be 50%. So prisons, how is visitation gonna look? You know, are they gonna let people rip their mask off and go get a pop? I don't know. I don't think so. So, you know, just because a vaccine is out, and just because there's a light at the end of the tunnel, in my opinion, we're going to be impacted for a long time. So, you know, that's -- that's, I believe, the truth -- the fortunate truth of the matter, but does anybody have a --

Art Stevenson: Ra -- Randy?

Hauth: Yes, go -- go ahead, Art.

Art Stevenson: Well, number one, you know, I -- I -- I understand it's really hard to project, well, we don't know how much money we're bringing in, so we can't do that. Might it be amicable, Eric, like we had recommended three thousand dollars; it -- it ended up we could only afford fifteen hundred, and so that's what, you know, we got. Is there a way that we could designate a percentage of the total net, like, just thrown off my head, fifty percent? Twenty-five percent? You know, to get some income coming in to the managers each month. And then when the quarter is over, then, you know, doing like a balloon payment or something at the end like that. Is there some way that we could possibly do something like that? What do you think?

Morris: I'm just trying to think that through, Art. I think the per -- the percentage thing just makes the math more complicated. So you're just -- are you -- is your intent to get --

Art Stevenson: Well, it's something -- well, it's something to think about. I just wanted to throw it out there. You can -- it's hard to project, and therefore, ha -- hard to come up with hard figures, and basically what I'm asking you is, if it's coming out, you know, if it's hard to come out with figures, maybe doing it on a percentage would -- a -- a percentage basis, rather than, you know, saying, oh, we want three hundred dollars. Is that a possibility? And you don't have to give me an answer right now; you -- you could think about it and send out, you know, if it's possible, and we could discuss it further as we go on, but, you know, like Randy said, I mean...you know, what's going on out there? We have no idea. Like, for instance, I've, you know, in the news, the governor has said in July she's gonna close three prisons; have you been notified on any of that kinda stuff by the prison system, or any of that, or are they just kinda gonna wait until it does happen and then let you know, or...have you heard anything about certain prisons being closed? 'Cause I know one of 'em's mine, and that would be Mill Creek that they're talking about closing down permanently.

Morris: I know there -- there'd been talk about that, it seems like a lifetime ago, Art, but I, you know, probably what, four or five months ago? But I haven't heard anything since then.

Art Stevenson: OK. Well, it was in the news the other day, that the governor said that she don't care what the legislators gonna do; she was gonna close down those three prisons, and -- and I was just wondering if you had heard anything. Obviously, you haven't, and -- and so maybe it would be wise, you know, to reach out to our head contact person and maybe get an update or something like that. I, you know, I don't have any idea what the le -- if there's gonna be pushback from the legislature or not, but that's what she said, and so maybe you could check that out with them and...she...you know.

Morris: I'll see what I can find out, Art.

Art Stevenson: [inaudible] Yeah, yeah, that would -- that -- that would be good. And then you can, I just wanted to throw out there the possibility of a percentage rate. Obviously, you know, you can think about -- about that, and maybe it would be a good way to put some money in the managers' hands, you know, to pay bills and all of that kinda stuff as -- as we move forward. 'Cause you do know everybody is losing money. OK. Well, anyway. That's my thoughts on that.

Hauth: Thanks -- thanks, Art. I -- I just want to say one other thing on that.

Jaynes: Chairman?

Hauth: So, I know I've heard, when I've listened to the blind Board meetings, I believe that Director Johnson and I think you've sent [inaudible] out in a email that -- and I -- I'm paraphrasing here, but basically that the legislators requested or required that 61,000 dollars that showed as obligated for personnel services, and that being taken out of set-aside or included in that. And it's my understanding, one that it's -- it's wrong to pay for staff out of set-aside. That's not a use of set-aside, from what I hear. And secondly, it's my understanding that the agency proposed budget went to the legislators and the governor, and it didn't come vice-versa. You know, the legislators didn't come and say, hey, guys, take this money out of set-aside and pay, at that time Art Marshall. So now I just wanna clear that up. I -- my -- what I -- what I am hearing is it's not proper, and the agency initiated that, not the legislators. Unless you have --

Jaynes: Chair?

Hauth: -- unless you have something other than that. 'Cause, you know, prove me wrong, I'm not sure. That's what I'm [inaudible].

Jaynes: Chairman Hauth?

Hauth: Yes?

Jaynes: Hi. I wanted to add something, if I could, regarding that Art brought up about the prisons. I spoke with two different people; one is my subcontractor Timber Country, who services Shutter Creek Prison for me, and I also called the prison and actually spoke with a -- a contracted employee working there in the prison about the issue of the prison being shut down. What I was told directly from the prison was that this had been brought up last year, as well, by the governor, that she wanted to shut 'em down. And the word going around the prison that I'm getting told is that she is going to do it, but they don't know when. They have been notified, I think she sent me a three hundred list there, with a hundred staff that would be transferred out of Shutter Creek. But right now, the prisons don't have anything definite. It's just mostly rumor, so, you know, [inaudible].

Art Stevenson: Well, Lin? Yeah, well, it was actually stated in the news here in Salem that -- the local news -- that the governor was going to close three prisons. The first was to be in July, and that would be Mill Creek, which is my -- one of my prison. And then the other two, there were no dates given, except for the fact that Mill Creek would be in July. And when I went in there to service it this weekend, you know, of course the visiting isn't running, but I still have to do the staff room, was that that's what was going to be happening. So anyways, I just wanted to bring that up, so, you know, Eric, you may be the last to know and stuff like that, but obviously, you know, getting some information would be good, and that's why I wanted to let you know about it, so as the director you could reach out and say, well, since the governor said it's closing, is it closing, or...or what?

Hauth: OK. Well, thank -- thank you. Eric, you know, whatever you can find out, you know, that -- that'd -- that'd be helpful. And...hey Lin, what -- I know we have like maybe twenty minutes left; what else do we have on the agenda just to give me an idea on [inaudible]?

Jaynes: Well, we've got -- we've got the micro markets, projected expense; we've got the agency position on priority law; we've got the assignment of vending machines during COVID --

Hauth: OK.

Jaynes: PSOB update; and then the comments. [inaudible]

Hauth: OK. We're just --. OK. We're gonna move -- we're gonna move along. OK, what's the next agenda item, Lin?

Jaynes: Micro mark -- micro markets, projected expense.

Hauth: Who asked for this? Was this Lewanda or Art? Go ahead.

Art Stevenson: Well, I just know there has been scuttlebutt that, you know, the Employment building, of course, we all know that Harold closed down because they moved a bunch of people out of there and there just wasn't business there. And that the plan was to probably do a micro market and stuff like that, and I just wanted to make sure that, you know, if we are gonna put 'em into micro markets, that, you know, the manager be involved and I know in -- in the past, you know, one manager went to a micro market and did all cashless, and then I know that others, well, Steve, for one, wanted his to be cash and cashless, and so I just wanted to make sure that, you know, if we are gonna invest in these things, that we're discussing with the manager and an appropriate survey's being done to make sure that the employees who are using it, you know, can do that. And so that's why I brought up the micro market thing is that, if that is gonna happen, and I know there have been discussions about possibly doing Char's, but we wanna make sure that -- that, you know, the people in the building are getting the kind of services that they want [inaudible] --

Hauth: OK. Let me -- let me ask Eric -- let me ask Eric to respond to that, Art, and then --. Eric, do you have anything?

Morris: Yeah, I mean, we're doing that. We're -- Char's looking at getting hers transitioned over here I think within about a month, month and a half. I don't have an update on Harold's, but the -- the micro market terminal, the most recent ones we bought, have been cashless terminals, which, all the information that I've heard and the people that I've talked to during COVID, people are much more inclined to use cashless versus cash during COVID, so -- which is good, because it saves us about...gosh, I want to say five or six thousand dollars per terminal to go cashless. It's a much more simple terminal, easier to operate kinda thing. But we're definitely working with each VFM to make sure that, you know, it's -- it's a system -- and the good thing about converting a lot of these places, there's not a lot of infrastructure that's needed, 'cause there's usually coolers there already, there's racking, you know, so the terminal's one of the bigger costs, and then just getting it formatted correctly for people to come in. And, you know, basically capturing those sales outside of normal business operating hours.

Art Stevenson: Well --

Hauth: OK.

Art Stevenson: -- my general concern is --

Hauth: Go ahead, Art.

Art Stevenson: My general concern is that, you know, my -- I wanna make sure that the people are -- if they're being surveyed on what kinda services they want made available to them, and -- and that of course the building manager is involved in the decision and stuff like that, too, 'cause I can say, you know, I have cash -- cash -- cashless in my vending machines, and -- and I get both. And I wanna make sure, you know, that we're able to realize as much profit, and we don't lose sales because that option isn't, you know, isn't available. And -- and so, you know, are the --

Hauth: Well, Art, let's -- let's move on to the next.

Art Stevenson: Yeah. Yeah.

Hauth: I think you've made your point. If we need to -- if we need to circle back to this somehow in the next meeting or, you know, Eric, hopefully you heard what Art is saying, and --

[undetermined]: Well, they're really trying to push those, aren't they.

Art Stevenson: What's that? The cashless?

Hauth: Go ahead.

Art Stevenson: I heard -- I heard somebody say something, and...

Hauth: Yeah, that -- I'm not sure who that was, but, Eric, go ahead.

Morris: Yeah, I -- I heard what Art was saying, and we're definitely doing that, Randy.

Hauth: OK. And then if we run into any other concerns, Eric -- or, Art, we can certainly bring it up or if, you know, those representati -- representing are having concerns, clearly we need to identify that as well, so. If you're done, then --

Art Stevenson: OK. That's why -- why I put it on the agenda.

Hauth: OK, bud. OK, what's next on the, uh, Lin?

Jaynes: Next item is agency position on priority law.

Hauth: OK, yeah, and maybe this was Art, also. I just wanna, you know, I wa -- just wanna hear a couple of --

Miranda: Chairman Hauth?

Hauth: Yes? Yes, Lewanda?

Miranda: All of the next i -- the next two or three items are from Steve.

Hauth: OK. So --. Thank you. So priority law, I mean, you know, we -- we all fought long and hard to amend the state statute to include the priority within the state statute, and personally, I haven't seen a lot of fulfillment of that priority, or fruit from that priority, unfortunately. We've seen, in my opinion, we've seen, I've seen the state statute get hijacked and become more of an administrative tool and regulatory item than it is like an expansive priority. Unfortunately, the opportunities that the agencies have brought on mostly have gone to sighted subcontractors, which is a doggone shame. Hopefully we're gonna be able to work through that, and, you know, we've talked about -- we've talked about commissaries and those have gone nowhere. I think the State Capitol did, you know, I think there was two opportunities, maybe the State Capitol and L&I that got, you know, opened up, but with COVID it's, you know, hard to actually tell how that's ever gonna go, but. You know, as -- I mean, has the agency ever talked about our priority, or the priority for the blind, or what it might look like, you know, even in COVID, to try and continue to grow the program, or...you know, what about the commissaries? What ever happened to that idea, you know, so. That was for you, Eric.

Morris: Oh, sorry, Randy. I -- I was just listening. Sorry.

Hauth: [laughs] No worries.

Morris: No, that's OK -- that's OK. It's -- it's -- it's getting late in the day. I'm sorry. I faded just a little bit. You know, I -- I think you're right about the history of the program, the -- the -- the work we did around the priority was, you know, I think pretty groundbreaking for the state. You know, we con -- we continue to try to pri -- apply the priority wherever we can. The commissary discussion and -- and working around the commissary, I think is definitely something we want to get into; it's just...yeah, I -- I mean, we've kinda beat that to a dead horse. But it's not something I've forgotten. I do have some interesting updates as part of my director's update, to talk about new opportunities that're gonna pop up, so I could definitely talk about that a little more.

Hauth: OK. Well, we'll -- we'll -- we'll go ahead and move on. You know, I think what I'm gonna do is I'm gonna formulate here a commissary subcommittee so we can kind of, you know, work on that with the agency on guiding that. But anyway, what's next on the agenda, Lewanda? Or, Lin, I'm sorry.

Jaynes: OK, hold on, I just lost my --. Hold on a second. Next on the agenda is the assignment of vending machines during COVID.

Hauth: OK. So this --. OK, thank you. So this is a Steve Jackson item, I think that he asked to be on it. Steve, I don't know if you wanna talk about it?

Jackson: I guess I just wanted to continue the conversation about how the unassigned vending machines were out there. Like the ones that're right next to me, like a block away from where I work, are assigned to, you know, assigned to people -- I want to talk about, how can I get assigned those vending machines, just to be blunt? How can other managers get more vending machines added to their site, too, you know? Like, how -- how can we...how can we start doing that?

Hauth: Well, I wish I had the answer to that. I don't know if Eric has the answer to that or not, but.

Morris: Well, I --

Jackson: Well, it's intended for Eric. Yeah, it's --

Hauth: OK.

Morris: Yeah, no, I --. That's -- that's OK. Hey, and I know we had some -- we had some good discussions back in December about this issue, and Randy obviously talked a little bit about the fact that there's a -- a complaint going through the system about -- about this process, too. But it seems to me that, you know, clear back in December, which feels like a lifetime ago, we were having some good discussions about, you know, a process for doing that. But I...right off the top of my head, I just don't remember where that landed. I think, if I remember right, one of the managers was gonna go back and work on that a little bit or something?

Art Stevenson: Randy?

Hauth: What's that?

Jackson: I think it's ultimately your decision, Eric.

Art Stevenson: Randy?

Jackson: 'Cause...do you have any good ideas, Eric?

Hauth: Art, go ahead. Go ahead, Art.

Art Stevenson: Well, well, I -- I know we had the discussion. We were trying to find out just exactly, you know, what was going on so that we could sorta help in making some decisions. I remember, in the meeting, we absolutely talked about Steve's location and the fact that...is there going to be a cafeteria there anymore, is the plan to make it a micro market or those kinda things, but. It's hard to plan and make decisions about anything when we don't go any, you know, and possibly when Eric makes his comments he will update us on, you know, like, what's going on at Steve's place. 'Cause I know the vending partners [inaudible].

Hauth: Well, we've -- we've got exactly fift --. Ten minutes left.

Art Stevenson: Well, anyways. Right.

Hauth: Go ahead.

Art Stevenson: So, you know, we gotta --. Well, we can't make any decisions if we don't know what's going on, and obviously decisions are being made out there, you know, just like I brought up about the prisons and stuff like that. And -- and -- and I think, you know, if we were more informed on what was going on or had some, you know, solid ideas on just what's gonna be happening, then, of course, we can make some decisions.

Hauth: OK. OK.

Art Stevenson: But, we obviously have to have that information so we can look to the future on, you know, what our program is going to look like --

Hauth: Well, let's -- let's hear what Eric --

Art Stevenson: -- when all this is done.

Hauth: Let's hear --. I agree with you, Art, but let's hear what, you know, we're running low on time, so let's hear what Eric has to say. And maybe within your report you can include the PSOB, 'cause I know that was a question. Steve, was there any other question that you had within your item?

Jackson: I just --

Hauth: Steve?

Jackson: Yeah, I'm here. I...I just wanted to have a conversation with Eric, keep it growing about the vending. And then the other question was, yeah, was, what's going on with the State Office Building on Oregon Street, which is, you know, my old site [inaudible].

Hauth: Well, let's -- let's see what Eric has -- let's see what Eric has within his report. Bottom line, talking about it is good, but if we don't get anything resolved out of it, you know...

Jackson: Right.

Hauth: I think that's -- I think that's what ended up pushing the complaint forward. Not that managers wanted to file a complaint, but felt it was, like, not the proper thing for the agency to be doing and, you know, taking 300 vending machines that're intended for blind. I mean, I know we've all heard this before, but we are where we are. We need to find a way to either force change, or hopefully the agency will have a desire to come to the table and say, hey, lookit --. You know, 'cause we're looking at other options, too. I know there's been talk about disparate treatment out there, and ADA violations; some different things that I know have been talked about. I think the best way to address these matters for the managers and for us, is to enter into some kind of agreement with the agency saying, lookit, this shouldn't be happening. This shouldn't be happening. Let's find a way to step through it. So I'm gonna turn -- I just wanted to throw that in there. If we have to go through the complaint process, or if people are, you know, they have to file -- file lawsuits, then, you know, so be it. But if we can find a better way to resolve it, that's great. So, Eric, go ahead. You -- your time.

Morris: Yeah, thanks, Randy, I appreciate that. So I talked to DAS Facilities, who's the, you know, the head of all DAS facilities, basically the landlord of the state. I talked to their maintenance person about two weeks ago now, talking about facilities. PSOB is one of 'em, they're getting ready to do a -- a big remodel there, which has been, I think, on the books for quite a while, and now we're finally getting ready to start it sometime in the future. But I think the -- aside from PSOB, which we're gonna have to figure out; you know, we talked about doing a micro market there. But on the bigger scale, the interesting thing -- like you were talking about GSA at the federal level; DAS is like their state counterpart -- is that all of the state buildings, they're really looking at how much we can...how much they're going to basically compress people into buildings. So they were talking about the fact they're gonna be canceling a lot of contracts with private buildings, bringing staff back into more, you know, more -- more staff in the buildings that the state does own. 'Cause a lot of agencies are shrinking their footprint in all these different buildings, because more and more people will continue to do telework in the future, so...I'm gonna see if I can mute people here who are kinda dinkin' around a little bit. So that's -- and I thi -- I think that's the thing you spoke to just a little bit, Randy, was the fact that it's hard to make a lot of decisions when we really don't know what's gonna happen going into the future. So that's -- that's, GSA was talking, I think that they said that like seventy percent of their agencies figure that the massive portion of their people will continue to telework, on the federal level. And the state level, there's -- there's been no decisions around that. I think really the focus with the state -- with state agencies is most people are teleworking if they can, and just trying to get through COVID at that point, then reassessing, you know, hopefully in the spring, I'm hoping that a lot of these places are gonna be, hey, this is -- we're bringing people back 'cause they've been vaccinated, or there's gonna be a rebalancing of staff within different buildings. So it's definitely a time of, I mean, we've been in this -- kinda stuff in this loop for about nine, almost ten months now. So it -- it is tough, but we're definitely trying to keep an eye on it. The prison thing, I'm not sure why I didn't hear anything about that recently. I definitely heard about it in the past, so it's just trying to figure out, you know, what's -- what's what type of thing, so. Interestingly enough, the Trimet -- Trimet reached out to the agency...I think that was last week or the week before, with preliminary talks around -- those of you who haven't been to a Trimet location, a lot of the major transit centers have snack bars, for lack of a better term, in them. There's like eleven of 'em scattered throughout the Trimet system. And Trimet is talking like they want to be able to turn those over to us to manage those locations. That would be eleven locations that they have scattered throughout the Portland Metro area. So that's really early preliminary talks, and I'm trying to get a survey completed for that so we can -- and to Art's point, I'm gonna make that a reoccurring process, moving forward, where when we do surveys, we'll just send 'em out every month, the surveys that were done each month, so that that can actually get done, 'cause that's definitely not been happening, as Art pointed out. And then Trimet also has a location at the end of the Gresham transit line, which is kinda central downtown Gresham: a restaurant space. It's essentially in a retail space, but it's a restaurant. And they wanted to know if we wanted to take that over. It's been vacant for a year or so. And so we're gonna get a survey done of that...I think that's tomorrow. So a couple interesting transitions with Trimet, some new opportunities popping up. And I'll definitely get you guys more details as that progresses along, hopefully in the next month or so. Any questions so far? I'm just kinda plowing through.

Garcia: I have a question. This is Trevor.

Morris: Yeah, Trevor?

Garcia: So I -- I mean, maybe this'll be part of the details when they come out, so I apologize. But I think the -- for a while, the Barbur Boulevard location of Trimet has been vacant. I think it's been vacant for several years, maybe at -- at least two, 'cause I know I've heard about that. But if they're reaching out, that's -- I heard that's definitely one that's been recommended to me that other vendors do -- would probably do pretty well at. I don't know with COVID right now, but, you know, it could be. Especially as people get more comfortable going out. But that would be really good a location.

Morris: Yeah, and I -- I -- I didn't realize the Barbur -- the Barbur Boulevard Transfer Center there had one of those, but you're definitely right, there's a huge structure there. That -- I've only been through there a couple times, but I think, like you mentioned Barbur, Gateway, the...the snack bar there at the MODA Center, I think is probably one of their busier ones, would be my guess. And then the Beaverton Transit Center has one. But there's also some that're...I think more seasonal, is a good way to describe it. So that's what we're trying to get a good handle on: is it -- is it something that would be productive for people to be running? You know, outside of COVID. Once COVID's over and people get back to normal, I think, you know, all bets are off at that point.

Garcia: Sure. Yeah. I mean, it does seem like some people are even traveling a little bit more now, but I don't know how many people still feel comfortable using the centers, but -- or, the stations, but I think it -- that is a great opportunity.

Hauth: Anything else, Eric?

Morris: Yeah, just -- just one up -- one new thing. The City of Hillsboro built a new community center, apparently, in the last year or so. The first stage of that is getting ready to open up. So they would like us to come out -- we did a survey recently, and we're taking a hard look at --. They want us to provide, basically, an espresso stand and stuff there, so we're trying to make sure we crunch the numbers on that to see if it would make sense. Right now, it's in -- it's in the first stage of the community center, where the second and third stages would include a pool and all of that kinda stuff. So we're trying to get some hard details around that to see if it would be viable. Apparently, it's a really beautiful facility out there, but, you know, it's -- it's trying to look past COVID to see what the traffic would look like, and see if it would be worth the investment to get in there and have somebody out there.

Hauth: Well, and -- and Eric, those things sound, you know, like promising and exciting, you know, maybe, I mean, maybe I'm wrong, but I think recently the Elected Committee at times feels like they've been left out of working with the agency on these development opportunities, so in your capacity as director, I hope you'll work with the agen -- or, work with the Elected Committee on, you know, considering different opportunities. That's one thing. And -- and, you know, before I -- before I leave -- the -- before the music call, I did -- and Lewanda, you're still on the call?

Miranda: I am.

Hauth: Lewanda? Lewanda?

Miranda: I'm here. Yeah, can you hear me?

Hauth: Hey. I wanted to ask you if you would -- if you wouldn't mind heading up a commissary development subcommittee?

Miranda: Sure.

Hauth: That would be --. You -- if you would do that. I know -- I know Art certainly will be involved in that, I hope, and, you know, others, you know, but I think if we could push -- if we could put a plan together to -- to try and forge forward through the priority on this. I mean, when you talk to Vend Engine, and you talk to Tennessee, clearly this is a successful opportunity, and again, you know, captive audience. I know that the whole monetary reimbursement or percentage is going to the sheriff's office, you know, are going to always be an issue, but it does look like there could be some great opportunities there for blind managers, and there can be some kinda compensation to the... So let's -- let's work on that. Let's put a plan together instead of just talking about it and sharing that we're unhappy that nothing's happening. Let's try and work together with the agency and forge that. So if you want to select some people to serve on that, that'd be great. The other thing, are there -- are there new trainees in the program, Eric?

Morris: We have --

Hauth: It looked like, on the legislative report, there were four new trainees?

Morris: Yeah. We have four people in training. Two people are getting rea -- pretty darn close to getting -- passing their licensing exam and stuff. So we got a couple people in the pipeline. And...yeah.

Hauth: OK. Anybody else have anything before we go? [inaudible] or anything? I hope not. Lin, how'd we do? Did I skip over anything?

Jaynes: Well, really you had other and then next meeting and adjournment. That was it.

Art Stevenson: Hey Randy?

Hauth: Well, and --. Yes? Yes Art?

Art Stevenson: Let's do a little housecleaning. You just got elected the chair again this last time, and we never did take a vote, and it's required, you know, to do the vice chair thing again, so...

Hauth: Oh, sure, sure, sure.

Art Stevenson: Do you want to -- do you want to clean that up so, you know, we follow proper protocol and get it done?

Hauth: Yeah, yeah. I would -- I would -- I would ask the Board's indulgence, or patience, in me requesting that my good vice chair, my advocate, Mr. Relentless, Art Stevenson, serve as the vice chair again going forward. Do we have a vote to accept that?

Art Stevenson: Please make a--.

Jackson: Yeah. I would make a motion to--

Jaynes: [inaudible]

Jackson: Yeah. I accept [inaudible].

Hauth: OK. Was there a motion?

Art Stevenson: There was.

Miranda: Yeah, Steve made one.

Hauth: OK. Was there a second?

Miranda: I'll second.

Jaynes: I second.

Hauth: OK. Lin -- Lin Jaynes?

Jaynes: Yea.

Hauth: Lewanda Miranda?

Miranda: Yea.

Hauth: Steve Jackson?

Jackson: Yea.

Hauth: I'll vote yea as well. Art Stevenson?

Art Stevenson: I may have a conflict, but I'll vote yes.

Jackson: You do. [laughs]

Hauth: OK. Is there anything else?

[undetermined]: [inaudible]

Art Stevenson: Is Derrick still there?

Jackson: Yeah, what about Derrick, man?

Hauth: Eric, anything else?

Jaynes: [inaudible]

Jackson: Yea, Derrick.

Derrick Stevenson: Yea.

Morris: Yeah, Randy, I think we're back --

Art Stevenson: OK.

Hauth: Hey, Derrick? Are you on?

Jackson: Yeah.

Art Stevenson: Yeah, he voted yea, Randy.

Hauth: Oh, yeah, OK, good. Sorry, Derrick. Hey, so --

Derrick Stevenson: It's alright.

Hauth: -- just [inaudible] know, the next meeting will be the third Thursday of next month. We're trying to regularly schedule those the third Thursday of each month. Of course, if anything comes up, we'll work with the agency on doing special meetings, but. So Eric, thanks for coming with the answers to the questions as best that you could do, so.

Morris: You're welcome, Randy. And that's the -- that looks like it's --

Art Stevenson: Shall we adjourn?

Hauth: Is that it?

Morris: Yep.

Art Stevenson: Yep.

Jaynes: That's it. We got through it [inaudible].

Hauth: Let's go ahead and adjourn.

Jackson: Cheerio.

Morris: Goodnight everybody.

**Motions Passed**

1. **“…to adopt [the previous meeting] minutes as recorded.”**

Proposed: Steve Jackson. Seconded: Lin Jaynes & Lewanda Miranda. Passed. Derrick Stevenson not present.

1. **“…that** **we adopt the Randolph-Sheppard active participation definition memorandum.”**

Proposed: Lewanda Miranda. Seconded: Steve Jackson. Passed. Derrick Stevenson not present.

1. **To accept Art Stevenson as vice chair.**

Proposed: Steve Jackson. Seconded: Lewanda Miranda & Lin Jaynes. Passed.

*Transcription by Katherine Peace at OCB.*