

MEETING MINUTES

October 30, 2013

GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE FOR THE PURCHASE OF COMMODITIES AND SERVICES FROM THE HANDICAPPED

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Cedric Greene at 10:00 a.m. October 30, 2013 at the WVARF office located at 400 Allen Drive, Charleston, West Virginia.

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

ABSENT: Gary Wolfe
Phillip Mason

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

Attended by Conference Call: Jan Smith
Brenda Bates
Carla Cleek

Guests: Dave Williams, WV State Auditor's Office
Dawn Warfield, WV State Auditor's Office

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Greene, who do we have on the phone with us today?

Jan Smith here, Brenda Bates and Carla Cleek are here also.

Mr. Greene, Mr. Sullivan is with us today and we have a quorum. There are two things that I am going to mention and then we are going to get on with the meeting.

- 1) For you Brenda, Jan and Everette, yesterday I traveled to Morgantown and was with Greg Morris with PACE the CRP there for their Disability Awareness month and their Awards Banquet. It was very nice and they wanted me to let you all know they appreciate your support. Former Senator Oliverio was there and some other delegates and also Mike Oliverio was there. He was the one I believe for the most part created CRPs in that area which is the way I understood it. So I just wanted to tell you that Greg Morris did a phenomenal job of setting that up and it was very well received. The clients that work there really enjoyed themselves and probably about ten (10) people were acknowledged and received awards, so it was a very good day.

- 2) I went out on the Secretary of State's Web on Wednesday so I was short about six hours of the five-day rule. I will probably go to Emergency Notice as it is out there and everybody knows that we are meeting. What I would like to do is make a statement and we will go ahead and start.

Mr. Greene, the Auditor's office is requesting an exemption and their request isn't to WVARF, it is to the Committee to have an exemption to go to Purchasing so they can put their imaging scanning project out in the open market or out to bid. With that being said, I think it is important that we suggest to the Auditor's office the first thing is although Jack Holcomb with Precision Services is not here, I guess you will sit in their stay Bill?

Mr. Monterosso, yes

Mr. Greene, I think it is important there be transparency in that we were in Executive Session the last time and in order for Mr. Sullivan who knows absolutely nothing about what we are getting ready to talk about. I don't want to go through the whole thing but what I do want to do is have him to have an understanding of the transparency not only he and I, but Brenda and Jan understand exactly what we are talking about. I believe for the most part it is apples to apples. I think everybody understood what the job was, and I think everybody bid on that job. The elephant in the room is that Precision Services was at least in some cases 50% higher than the other vendors and on its face it can be problematic to anybody, I don't care who it is. It had to have shocked Precision as well. Precision was here and they spoke and I don't think they came across that it wasn't accurate, I think they stood behind the fact that they have other processes in place that would be some of that money, certainly would not be all of that money maybe a portion of that money but also I think they agreed their equipment may not be as 2013 as these other vendors, and I think that is probably a fair statement. Those are the only two things that I recall specifically that were the justifications that came from Mr. Holcomb that day. What I would like to have happen Mr. Williams, the bottom line is, the money piece to it where vendor A) bid was at \$422,000 or whether Vendor B was this and C was that, for a lack of a better word that is essentially all public information and for us to do it in Executive Session it was fine to understand what you were going through but for you all to want us to make a motion or any kind of motion, those numbers need to be transparent. You all need to tell us what those numbers are in an open forum or I can tell you quite honestly I don't even think a motion will happen, but it may, that is up to Mr. Sullivan, Jan and Brenda. What are your thoughts and take on that.

Mr. Williams, that's what came out in us doing an RFQ, it would allow everyone to submit bids and then those bids would be transparent but for me to make them transparent to the vendors, if I am going to do that I should contact all the vendors and give them copies of whatever I would disclose here and let everybody see everyone's bid. That really creates issues. If we had gone to bid and for whatever reason the bid was thrown out and we had to rebid it. Once all the vendors know what the other vendors are bidding it creates issues for that low bidder because everyone knows what his price is – they are all jockeying around to get below that price and some of them may be able to do it but adjusting prices others may be doing it in a way that you really can't determine what was done until after the fact, after you have made an award where you really find out you really got less than what you thought you were getting. As an example, Precision's bid their estimated volume of documents that they can do was 1/5th of some of the other vendors estimated quantities. Yet their price is as costly as two of the other vendors. I would pay twice as much and the project is going to take longer to get it done and over time that will have an additional cost. I just don't feel comfortable...

Mr. Greene, is there any other information that you all have that I could pick up the phone and call them and they would give me – because Precision would, if Precision got a phone call out of the blue they would just tell you. What makes this company's information so secretively so secure that they wouldn't just give the information out if we called and asked them?

Ms. Warfield, I don't know whether they would say this is our price for scanning a 12 x 6 document but we asked for certain specific sizes and quantities. In competitive bidding, Purchasing never releases the bids, never shares the pricing until after the bids are opened and a contract is awarded because vendors price certain service products or services based on how big a job they are going to get. If you are going to buy 100,000 widgets' they are going to cost you less, they are going to give you a volume discount probably than if you were buying one widget. We say we are doing 2 million or 4 million documents they might on a quote give you a better price than they would for 100 or 200. It is kind of unfair for one vendor to see the other vendors pricing unless as Dave said everybody gets to see it. We share everyone's quotes with everyone else so that when they go to bid again they know what the competition is doing. Kind of defeats the whole purpose.

Mr. Monterosso, how did you get those numbers in the first place?

Mr. Williams, we asked for quotes.

Mr. Monterosso, you just asked for a harmless quote? So it is not a bid, you didn't put out an RFQ.

Mr. Williams, it is a bid in the sense that I basically sent them what was going to be my RFQ. The document that Precision got that was the basis for an RFQ.

Ms. Warfield, because Purchasing asked for figures.

Mr. Williams, I shared that with all four vendors. I asked all four vendors for the exact same quote. I asked them to estimate the quantity of documents that they thought they could get done in a month and then I asked for a per document cost and then to take it a step further, I even asked them to bid based upon the number of documents that were in each document class type. I was as fair and open as I could be as to what I wanted a price on. They all responded, you and Precision were in my office and we talked about their bid, they said they couldn't do any better, well I have other bids that are better and half the price and getting more done in a shorter period of time. Also, I think I said at the last meeting, I am not trying to keep Precision from getting the bid, if they can be competitive, even if they are a little more I don't mind giving them a preference, but 50%, I can't deal with that and if I am forced to we will just put the project on hold for another ten years and we won't do it. I am not going to pay that kind of premium to get it done.

Ms. Warfield, I think there is a legitimate exception for the Board to consider matters involving competition, that if disclosed, this event could put the agency in a financial disadvantage. It is possible that if they know what the other vendors are charging and if they see other vendors are charging more, they would say wow, we are losing some profit here, we might want to raise our prices a little if this is what the market is. If yours is deemed to be the market price it may be the other vendors will raise their prices to meet yours. It could potentially cost the Auditor's office money.

Mr. Williams, I have already told Precision and you the differences in terms of percentages and that is more than the other vendors know right now.

Mr. Monterosso, here is the thing and I appreciate that. Where I am coming from and I think where the Governor's Committee is coming from is theoretically, the CNA is not a vendor, it is part of the legislation so you are required to go through WVARF for anything, a service or a commodity. Our interest, at least mine and I'm sure the Governor's Committee interest is not to get the quote because I am a fair broker in this room, I don't work for the CRPs, I don't work for State Government, we manage the contracts and we subcontract those out. My full intention/purpose and the same discussion I had with Jack and his crew and other CRPs is that we have to be competitive and if in fact that cost was twice as high, why? Now, two things, 1) Jack has agreed to utilize his own money to spend over \$120,000 on a piece of equipment that will reduce the cost and making it efficient and I shared that at the last meeting, and 2) Precision has been in this game a long time and they have been low balled which is no problem, their cost might be a little higher, there is added value and a lot of reasons that double blind is \$40,000, you are not saving anything if taking double blind out other than the fact that you are getting almost a guarantee of 100% accuracy if not a guarantee of 100% accuracy. But they have been in this game a long time where they have lost bids and the same agency that acquired went to A B or C and I will not name names, came running to Precision saying please and matter of fact, there have been occasions where the same vendor just dropped everything and went to Precision and Precision had to swallow and lose a lot of money just to build that relationship and say we will take care of that agency, we will do it for them. That is what I am trying to prevent. To try to get a clear understanding of how we as a state use program can be competitive, I am not worried about under cutting people as I can't compete with Staples, that is not my intention. My intention is to create sustainability and to make sure that we are competitive in the open markets so the state is getting the best value. I can't do that with the cost cut in half.

Mr. Williams, I am not asking you to undercut the other price, I am just asking for that margin of 50% to be reduced to something that is reasonable.

Ms. Warfield, has the CNA seen the pricing?

Mr. Monterosso, no

Ms. Warfield, the problem and my concern is the CNA and Precision are together now and that is your preferred vendor and any information we share with you we would like to not be passed on.

Mr. Monterosso, I am not going to do that.

Mr. Greene, here is the thing, first of all the Committee's role is not to base our decisions or go down the road of solely on the price. We may be getting wrapped around the axle on price when in fact Mr. Williams is very accurate when he says that the numbers are 50% and 42%. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure it out that if it was a million dollars, if that is what Precisions thing was, a million dollars, and they were 50% higher, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to say that probably around \$500,000 is that price, we already know that. The other number was 42% or 44% so we know that someone came in \$400,000 mark. I don't want to spin our wheels on that because that I don't think that is the telling point of what way the direction of the Committee should go.

Ms. Warfield, the first thing they have discussed was petitioning the Committee to reduce the prices on the statewide contract based on these numbers, and you are telling us that Precision is willing to take another look at it and reduce their pricing if they get new equipment.

Mr. Williams, but they sat across from me in my office and said no, they wouldn't and they said the same thing the last time we met.

Mr. Monterosso, no they didn't, when we were at your office the \$120,000 purchase of equipment wasn't in the equation.

Ms. Warfield, that came up at the last meeting.

Mr. Monterosso, at the last meeting they talked about it and I came back with new prices which reduced it by about \$220,000.

Ms. Warfield, I'm sorry I didn't identify myself to anyone, I'm Dawn Warfield from the Auditor's office speaking.

Mr. Greene, do you have the leeway to remove this QC at \$40,000, do you have the leeway to do that? They say they don't want that.

Ms. Warfield, is that on the statewide contract automatically? Is that included in the statewide contract?

Mr. Monterosso, Precision has the statewide contract for document imaging.

Ms. Warfield, and you can select which one you want and that is one of the options you can select?

Mr. Monterosso, no, Precision has the contract for statewide imaging and part of their delivery of service is their method of imaging those documents which is literally at 100% accuracy and there are letters of reference from multiple state agencies.

Ms. Warfield, so there is no way to separate that out?

Mr. Monterosso, and Jack said, we'll do whatever they want but they are afraid and out of Jack's mouth is we can give what they want, we are afraid they are not going to be happy and they don't want their reputation to be tainted if they are not doing those extra measures to make sure that you have 100% accuracy. That is his only concern. If you just want images scanned and indexed and they do the indexing anyway.

Mr. Williams, that's not what he said when I asked him a question. I asked him a question in my office and he said, no, we won't take that out.

Mr. Greene, Brenda and Jan was is your take?

Ms. Smith, it was my understanding that Jack did say he wouldn't take that piece out, I didn't hear him say he would.

Mr. Greene, Bill why don't you go call him then we can deal with the facts.

Ms. Smith, I have a prior meeting at 10:30 already setup.

Mr. Greene, Brenda do you have any comments?

Ms. Bates, I feel that a lot of the issues are possibly the equipment and I think it is good that the Auditor's office has brought this to our attention because we need to look at it in relationship to the entire statewide contract. I think that we do need to be competitive but I feel that Precision Services can get to the point where they are competitive. But, I also feel that the customer is the customer and if this double blind thing which I have no idea what that means, is something they don't want then it should be an option not a requirement. I guess that is my thought of what I am thinking on it.

Ms. Smith, you said that better than what I could have Brenda and I agree totally with what you said. I do think Precision Services needs to upgrade and do some things to put them more in line with their competitors which they should be given the option to do that. They also need to do what the customer wants them to do. I'm sorry but I am going to have to leave.

Mr. Greene, ok we have a quorum without you, thanks Jan.

Mr. Greene, anything else Brenda?

Ms. Bates, that is my bottom line on it. I think it can be worked out and like I said I think it got to our attention. A good thing about looking at the whole statewide contract anytime things come up in terms of things that are based on technology to be sure our CRPs are staying in line with the technology that is necessary to do the work. I am not inclined to agree to exempt it just because you know our role is to ensure that individuals with disabilities have jobs and maintain their jobs and I think this can be done and everybody can be satisfied. I do want to reiterate what Cedric said when we look at pricing and fair market pricing and value we are also looking at things unique to the state use program so it definitely is not all about pricing and as we all know a lot of companies particularly companies that do things at higher quantities can low ball and come up with a lot of pricing. I think the goal is to work this out with Precision and the Auditor's office and make it work into something that is reasonable for everybody.

Ms. Warfield, may I ask then, if the Committee is not willing to consider granting the Auditor's office an exemption today is the alternative your suggesting is adjusting the pricing on the statewide contract? If that is where we are then if we have to go with the statewide contract then it needs to be re-priced.

Mr. Greene, Jack, we have in the room Mr. Williams and Ms. Warfield with the Auditor's office, Everette Sullivan who is on the Committee, Bill Monterosso and Brenda Bates on line. It is unfortunate that you are not here because I do have at least four questions for you.

1) Mr. Greene, do you have the correct equipment to do the job?

Mr. Holcomb, we have equipment that will do the job that is what we were talking about upgrading and spending \$120,000 on new equipment which would be more efficient and get the job done quicker and lower the price of about \$250,000 if we purchased that equipment.

2) Mr. Greene, can you get the equipment and is this something that takes a year or three weeks, how long will it take to get the equipment?

Mr. Holcomb, I would say we could probably have it in about three weeks. The person we purchase our equipment from, it would be a matter of them getting it to us.

Mr. Greene, do you think it would be three weeks to a month?

Mr. Holcomb, correct

Ms. Warfield, can I ask how much that would increase their volume?

Mr. Greene, what would that take you from as it relates to the Auditor's request?

Mr. Holcomb, I don't have those numbers in front of me but I'm thinking if I'm not mistaken, it is around 1200 to 1500 hours. I'm thinking that is what was estimated on those machines.

Ms. Warfield, that is better than 12,000 a month.

- 3) Mr. Greene, do you feel if you had the right equipment your staff would already be trained or would they need to be trained to get up to par?

Mr. Holcomb, not necessarily, it would be the same type as we use now it would be a little faster than what we have.

Mr. Williams, if I recall they weren't planning on using existing staff, they made mention of trying to hire someone from Goodwill Industries.

Mr. Greene, would you need additional staff or would you use the staff that you have?

Mr. Holcomb, we had a lady in the Charleston area that Goodwill used before and she said she would be interested in working on this job, so we would look at hiring one additional person for that job down there.

- 4) Mr. Greene, where would this person work?

Mr. Williams, our warehouse in Malden, West Virginia.

Mr. Holcomb, I think she actually lives in that area so it would be convenient for her to get to work.

- 5) Mr. Green, would you be willing to take the quality controls out of it if it is not a requirement or a need that the Auditor's office wants that we value somewhere near \$40,000?

Mr. Holcomb, we would be willing to do that. Like I said the only reason we do that for our customers, you sit there and type eight hours and there are going to be mistakes made but Mr. Williams said that they have other data base that could be used too.

Mr. Greene, so you are willing to remove that out of there?

Mr. Holcomb, I think that would be a \$40,000 savings.

Mr. Greene, let me just say this as a side note to you Jack. I didn't really speak to you much a couple of weeks ago when we had the meeting. Just as a general comment that I will make to you that I believe the Committee believes. I think Mr. Sullivan is on board, I think Ms. Bates is on board and Ms. Smith is on board and I am certainly on board. The customer is not always right, and the Auditor's office they are not always right. But, the customer is not always wrong either and the customer is the customer and I think and you know you can never be stuck in the sand on anything when you are dealing with the customer. Doesn't mean the customer always gets what they want, doesn't mean they are always right, but what it does mean is that they are at your doorstep and they need a service and as long as you don't break the law or as long as you don't go in debt or as long as you don't compromise the philosophy of your company or what it is that you say you do, respectfully I say this to you, you have to try to move a little bit to the left a little bit to the right but stay within the boundaries so that you can give the customer what they want so they continue to come back and then secondly, make a profit in that process. I think that this thing got a little off the paved road from your side of the table when Mr. Williams and I am speaking for him, although he has never said anything to me as it relates to this, but I get the impression that he felt as though he wasn't the customer anymore. The Auditor's office felt like they were being told what they were going to get and what they were going to take and what price and when you do that, guards come up and people are like – Whoa, I am the customer and I was just at Wal-Mart and I just told Wal-Mart that I didn't like the service or product that I got and they gave me my money back but then when I come to you guys, you are pretty much telling me – boom, boom, boom, boom and you are not being very workable. So, in corporate America you are out there more than I am but I can tell you that is one thing that never ever happens to me personally, I never get screwed by anybody because if I don't get what I pay for I hold them accountable until things are right. I think that is what the Auditor's office and Mr. Williams are saying – hey, we're the customer and so what we are looking for is for you all to be reasonable towards the approach and work with this and contrary to what I thought before I don't think even before the last meeting, I just thought the Auditor's office just wanted to go out to corporate America and I definitely don't get that feeling today. I get the feeling that they just want a product and they want a service for a reasonable price or for a price that they can go to sleep at night and we are not saying that should bankrupt you guys. We are just saying we have got to give you the technology, give you the personnel, Bill Monterosso has to help you guys, how can they help you all to make sure that they help you, not just for the Auditor's office, but for everybody that approaches you guys that you guys are working in lockstep with corporate America so you guys can be competitive with the people out there that do the imaging. That is my three minute customer service related conversation and that is just my take on it. Anything else you would like to say?

Mr. Holcomb, I would like to apologize to Mr. Williams, I didn't realize he was told we were not willing to work with him on the blind indexing.

Mr. Greene, there is a process in place Mr. Holcomb, you remove this QC and you guys are imaging and your imaging is Mr. Williams responsibility and his project manager's responsibility to say, hey slow down, we are day three into it and we are a little off track. That is his job and so there is a process in place to hold you guys accountable and it is Mr. Williams responsibility and the Auditor's responsibility to know what that process is and file their complaints or their concerns after working with you all through this Committee, through Purchasing and we will come in and slap your hand and say, hey you need to move a little to the left or a little to the right. Let's not get ourselves beat up on this QC thing; there is a process in place to keep you guys straight.

Ms. Warfield, how do we work with the statewide contract because it is already there, the pricing is there, are they going to adjust their pricing for the statewide contract, how can we do a contract off contract.

Mr. Holcomb, we can adjust, we will look at the numbers, we have actually lowered our prices of what is on the statewide contract for the size document you have. The way Mr. Williams submitted that he wanted a price per document. The way we bid that it was like a cost per document, like I said, if we purchase new equipment we can save quite a bit of money, it is not going to cut it in half but it will knock maybe \$200,000 - \$250,000 off the price we had quoted.

Ms. Warfield, are you going to adjust your pricing for the statewide contract for the Committee? That is what I am asking because how do we want to work with them, we are stuck with what is on the statewide contract right now.

Mr. Holcomb, no we are not going to charge what is on the statewide contract.

Mr. Williams, without you adjusting the contract, we can't do the contract.

Ms. Warfield, that is why we asked to do separate bids.

Mr. Holcomb, we can charge you less but we can't charge you more than what is on the statewide contract.

Ms. Warfield, I thought the price is the price.

Mr. Williams, the price has to be available for anyone at the same price.

Ms. Warfield, if you are willing to lower it for us then it ought to be lowered for everyone; if it is a fair market price then it needs to be reduced.

Mr. Holcomb, we are lowering it because of the volume as you are talking millions of images.

Mr. Williams, do you remember our conversation that it was written into the document that I sent you, that we are not going to do a contract for all \$3 million all at once. We are going to do this on an annual basis and what the budget will permit.

Mr. Greene, does that still keep you in the same mindset Mr. Holcomb knowing that instead of it being \$4 million it is going to be \$1 million a year or \$500,000 a year.

Mr. Holcomb, most of the time we have a file come in that has 8 ½ X 11 documents in it and 4 – 5 maps and typically we are not scanning millions of images.

Mr. Greene, we are still in that volume arena.

Ms. Bates, I think we need to have Jack and the CNA look at the pricing that is on the statewide contract and if volume makes it different in terms of the pricing then that should be reflected on the statewide contract. If it is up to 50 it is one price and if it is 500,000 it is another price then I think it has to be reflected on the statewide contract. It is something I think Precision and the

CNA need to look at and bring back to us at the next meeting which is November 20th. By then they should know when they are going to have their equipment and they should have a better idea of the information and we can do a change order to Purchasing or whatever we need to do. But, I agree with the Auditor's office in that we can't make an exception or just say work it out, it has to be what is on the statewide contract and like I say if volume makes a difference then that needs to be reflected on the statewide contract as well.

Mr. Monterosso, did you hear that Jack?

Mr. Holcomb, yes I have no problem with that. Like I said it hasn't been a problem in the past because we have never had a job this large.

Ms. Warfield, and we have one different size, right?

Mr. Williams, we have one size that you don't even have on the contract, can you add that to it too?

Mr. Greene, this is what we will do. This is what we will ask of you Mr. Holcomb. First of all, please make this your priority, ok? That would be the first thing. We know that the next meeting is November 20th at 10:00 at the same place and I would really like for you to be here personally.

Mr. Holcomb, ok

Mr. Greene, with that being said, that is twenty days away and you can build a house in thirty days, not a very good house but you can build a house in thirty days. What we would like to see happen is for you and your team working with Bill Monterosso and his staff come up with what those volume numbers are. And I think it is ok for you to work with Mr. Williams so you guys can come up with something from his perspective because he is truly the customer, doesn't mean it is going to get approved but what it does mean is that you have somebody in your corner. He can kind of help you with that volume number so that when this circumstance happens again with the Secretary of State's office or with someone else, when it comes up we already have a template and it is already on the contract as Brenda has asked. Does that make sense?

Mr. Holcomb, sure

Mr. Greene, I think Mr. Williams wants to try to help you and he can give you some knowledge of where he is coming from.

Ms. Warfield, and if they are committed to going ahead and getting the new equipment, they ought to go ahead and get it.

Mr. Williams, I don't know if I would go ahead and get the equipment until we know that we are going....

Ms. Warfield, they need to be competitive.

Mr. Greene, in order for you all to be competitive you guys have to find out from a business standpoint working with the Board and with Bill Monterosso whether or not that is a good thing for you guys to do.

Ms. Warfield, if we decide we can't afford to do it, I don't want them to be stuck with a machine.

Mr. Williams, the reason I am sitting here is because the boss said he didn't want to pay that amount of dollars.

Ms. Warfield, if he is not going to get the equipment anyway I don't want to do it on the idea that the Auditor's office is going to get the contract, but if he needs the new equipment to get those numbers down then he will probably need it for the statewide contract and that is the consideration they need to make.

Mr. Greene, with Bill Monterosso, Jack and your board, Jack you guys have to decide if this is a good business model for you to move forward and get new equipment.

Ms. Warfield, just so they would be competitive and can get better pricing for the statewide contract.

Mr. Greene, lastly, and I will get with Purchasing, we need to get the process in place to add volume to the statewide contract. I will get with Dave Tincher as it relates to that.

Mr. Holcomb, ok

Mr. Greene, do you feel ok Mr. Holcomb or do you feel like you just got beat up?

Mr. Holcomb, I agree, I will get with Steve and Bill and his guys and we can sit down and look at the pricing structure. Like I said in the past we have never had a job this huge and it has never been an issue. Jobs even with Department of Highways, they have a lot of maps that have large size documents and it would be to our advantage to have that in place.

Mr. Greene, Brenda do you have anything else?

Ms. Bates, I am just a little concerned about the statement from the Auditor's office regarding we may or may not do that. After going through all of this and trying to do competitive bidding, I don't understand why – it just concerns me a little. I agree that the CRPs need to be competitive and have the equipment but at the same time they are not corporate America and they can't go out and spend a whole bunch of money, it may benefit in the long run, I am just saying for the record, it concerns me that we would have a state agency that would go to this length to get an exception and then say, well if the price is lowered I am not going to do it possibly.

Mr. Williams, it depends upon how much it is lowered. He made the comment it would probably reduce the cost \$250,000. Using your example, if it was a million and \$500,000 that is still \$250,000 more than what someone else bid, I don't know if my boss is willing...

Ms. Warfield, he said he wasn't willing to do it at their original price because it was higher.

Mr. Williams, he wasn't going to pay more than what the market....

Ms. Warfield, if we get a fair market price it sounds like a fair price then we will go forward, but we can't guarantee we will go forward because we haven't seen the new pricing yet.

Mr. Greene, I think what alarmed Mr. Williams is when he heard Ms. Warfield say, "buy equipment" that concerned him.

Ms. Warfield, we are not going to promise to do it.

Mr. Greene, that is what alarmed him, he just wanted to make sure everybody is crystal clear that it is not his call to pull the trigger, it is truly the Auditor's call from a budgetary standpoint, hey we are going to do it for X amount or we don't have the money to do it for X amount. I think he was just concerned that Ms. Warfield was giving the ok to go out and spend \$120,000 of someone else's money and then putting the Auditor on the hook. Even though I think we all know that would not hold up to anybody but I think it kind of made him a little nervous.

Ms. Warfield, don't go buy the equipment thinking you are going to get the contract.

Ms. Bates, for the record and I do worry as I want individuals with disabilities to be employed and I want the CRPs to do well and I just felt obligated to say that but I understand and I know there is no guarantee but I'm hopeful that we can get competitive pricing and that the Auditor's office would be willing to go ahead with it even with if it is over a five year period or two year period or whatever. I just needed to say that. They said what they needed to and I said what I needed to.

Ms. Warfield, thank you for the clarification.

Mr. Greene, what we will do now is there won't be any motions other than to adjourn but what we will do is, Mr. Holcomb you know what you have for action, Mr. Williams is receptive to your phone calls so that you guys can dialogue and interact and try to come up with something that works so to speak, not just for him but he can speak because I think he has been living with this thing for a while and I think he understands the numbers more so than most of us do. Bill Monterosso will work with you and your board to make sure you guys research, investigate the right equipment for doing jobs like this. Lastly, I will get with Mr. Tincher at Purchasing about making a change to the statewide contract so that it reflects volume per Ms. Brenda's suggestion which I think is a great suggestion.

Mr. Greene, I just want to add a last statement; I want to thank everyone for their involvement in this because clearly I think we all want to do the right thing. I don't think anybody wants people with disabilities not to be employed or not to have opportunities to be employed; I don't think anybody wants that. I think everybody wants them to have an opportunity but with that being said there is always a product that you have to provide and you have to provide it in a timely manner and you also have to have a reasonable cost that someone can lay down and sleep at night. We all can become smarter and better by our interactions and coming to the table with clear minds and I think we have done that today and I am very, very impressed with you Mr. Holcomb being willing to entertain our suggestions on maybe a different business model so that we can get to the instate. There are 20 days, there should be plenty to do, and we will meet again on November 20th. Now, on November 20th when we meet, this is the expectation. The expectation is you will have done the things that I have asked that would be the expectation and if at that point we get a point that we cannot come to something, then your request comes right back on November 20th and we will make a motion and we will vote on it. What we are not going to do is hold off until December and we are not going to go to an emergency jail court or whatever they have over there. November 20th something is going to happen, you and Mr.

Holcomb and you guys are going to come up with something because you have 20 days to do it or on the 20th there is going to be a motion of something. Whether or not the motion passes or not that is another story that is not my role. My role is to make sure that it happens.

Ms. Warfield, so the board is not going to vote on our request for a waiver until then?

Mr. Greene, correct and I think we have all gotten a little bit smarter so Mr. Holcomb has 20 days with Bill Monterosso and Mr. Williams to work together as a team and come up with something and maybe we can't, but that doesn't mean we are not friends and that doesn't mean we can't move on to get ready for the next issue. We just get ready for the next issue because the next issue is coming. On the 20th two things will happen: 1) you will come with a plan, maybe the plan works, maybe the plan doesn't work, or 2) we will do a motion to either grant or not grant the Auditor's request for an exemption to the state use program.

Mr. Williams, Jack are you still there? This is Dave Williams, I am going to be out of the office next week, I will be in DC next week but if you could do whatever ground work you can do then if we need to meet give me a call the following week.

Mr. Holcomb, ok I will Dave.

Mr. Greene, everybody good? Ok I appreciate everyone, Ms. Bates I appreciate your input and your time.

Ms. Bates, no problem – I think it worked out well and I do appreciate everyone.

Ms. Warfield, we are hopeful.

Mr. Greene, Mr. Holcomb we appreciate you so you and Bill will link up and start the process.

Mr. Holcomb, ok thank you Cedric.

Mr. Greene, Everette I appreciate you being here.

Mr. Sullivan, I enjoyed the conversation and I think we have the players involved and we will be able to settle the problem.

Mr. Greene, I agree and then on the 20th we will do something.

MOTION #1

Mr. Sullivan, I make a motion to adjourn.