

NCBV Meeting Minutes

April 11, 2014

3:30pm

I. Roll Call and Confirmation of Quorum, Richard Saperstein, Chairperson

A Quorum was present at this meeting

Richard Saperstein, Chairperson

Bert Hansen, Vice Chairperson

Bill Schley, Secretary and Northern Representative

Harold Petrofsky, Southern Representative

Operators Present:

Carol Ewing

Nels Brown

Mikie Yamada

Mike Mulanax

Beth Perring

Dustin Varnell, Operator Trainee

Lee Weiss, Operator Trainee

Staff Present:

Melaine Mason, Deputy Administrator, Rehabilitation Division

Drazen Elez, BEN Program Chief, Rehabilitation Division/BEN

Scott Haag, BEO II, Rehabilitation Division/BEN

Russell Smith, BEO I, Rehabilitation Division/BEN

Janette Parish, AA IV, Rehabilitation Division/BEN

II. First Public Comment Session, Richard Saperstein

Drazen Elez wished to note that Kawana Pohe called earlier that day to advise that he would not attend this meeting due to business matters.

III. For Possible Action-Vote to Accept the Agenda, Richard Saperstein

Bert Hansen made a motion to accept the agenda; Harold Petrofsky seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

IV. Verification of Posting, Russell Smith

Russell Smith verified that the agenda was posted in a timely and acceptable manner.

V. Welcome and Introduction of Guests, Richard Saperstein

Carol Mulanax was present.

VI. For Possible Action-Approval of the minutes for the Nevada Committee of Blind Vendors meeting, February 21, 2014, Richard Saperstein

Harold Petrofsky made a motion to accept the meeting minutes and Bert Hansen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

VII. Old Business

A. Discussion-Update regarding Strategic Planning Project, Drazen Elez

Drazen Elez initiated this discussion by updating a number of the goals which have realized progress in the past few months.

Goal #1- Training for both Operators and Staff

Mr. Elez reported that the trainees are about to complete their class room part of their training program that next week. Existing Operators were offered Upward Mobility training within the past couple of months with Carol Ewing taking advantage of this opportunity. In addition BEOs Russell Smith and Scott Haag also attended business and food service management training over the past couple of months. Mr. Haag will also receive VR blindness program training within the next week following this meeting.

Goal #2- Recruitment Opportunities

It was mentioned by Mr. Elez that there was a meeting with the Vocational Rehabilitation and BSBVI counselors working to update them on the Referral Policy and its protocol while inviting ideas with regard to how the Bureau can help them to ensure additional clients referred to the training program. Counselors were also asked what other type of written materials we would need to develop for the training program

Goal #3- Growth

According to Mr. Elez, the Program has focused its efforts on operating BEN's unmanned facilities without the use of partners using the DOE Support Unit Facility as an example. He pointed out that this effort not only benefits Goal #3 but Goal #4 as well.

Goal #4- Manage Program resources effectively

In the matter of the budget aspect of this goal Mr. Elez revealed the Bureau's work on systematically replacing and buying new equipment based on the age of its existing inventory. This budget would reflect to the fiscal years of 2016-17 asking the Committee to help develop this bi-annual budget.

Goal #5- Policies and Procedures

Mr. Elez reported that there were a couple of policies that the Bureau has worked on to enhance or develop. He continued to say that as soon as the subcommittees are named we will work with those subcommittees to get them finalized.

Richard Saperstein asked which policies were being considered. Mr. Elez answered that it was the Retirement and Health Insurance Policy and that they were wishing to simply enhance the current policy which was now in place and would update the assembly as soon as progress has been made.

Mr. Elez named another policy which was under consideration which determines the procedure dealing with the occurrence of a sudden absence of an operator for various reasons and how the Bureau could ensure a continued flow of operation. Currently, there is no procedure in place for this emergency.

Nels Brown addressed Drazen Elez to ask if the Program was out of the vending business with regard to buying new vending equipment. Mr. Elez answered that this purchase decision would fall on each Operator's discretion as the Bureau would not furnish that type of equipment. He continued by explaining that if an Operator wished to operate their own vending and circumvent a third party company, the Bureau would provide them with that opportunity.

Mr. Elez reminded all of a past vote during a meeting in which the Committee and BEN Staff member had decided that if a third party company was operating a site, the Bureau would not purchase vending equipment for them, leaving it to the Operator themselves to service that machine. Nels Brown questioned if an Operator cannot contract with a vending company for a certain area and there was no other alternative and with the Operator administering the site, could he/she obtain vending equipment in order to keep that facility in service. Drazen Elez answered that this was a discussion the Bureau was considering while evaluating the cost of the equipment versus its benefit and whether the sales in the site would justify the installation of that piece of equipment. Once this benefit analysis is determined and the fit of that site is favorable, then that equipment would be provided. Mr. Brown commented that with his "vending track record" the Bureau would realize a 40-50 year equipment duration because he services all his equipment. Mr. Elez then advised Mr. Brown that if there was a project he was interested in to contact BEO II, Scott Haag, and complete a request for equipment form and work from there.

At this time Richard Saperstein questioned Bert Hansen and Harold Petrofsky wondering if they remembered the development of this vending policy. Bert Hansen answered that one had to have a business plan if the Bureau was to purchase new equipment for a facility. Mr. Saperstein agreed and also advised Nels Brown to put together a business plan and submit it to Scott Haag for review to which Mr. Brown called this idea a possibility. Miki Yamada asked that if the Bureau provided a vending machine without a third-person company and the equipment did not operate what the procedure would be and who would repair it. Richard Saperstein answered that if a piece of equipment owned by the Bureau breaks, an Operator was to call the BEO and they will have it repaired.

Beth Perring commented that when she was assigned the City Route, there was a different Program Chief in place and it was determined that the Program would no longer buy vending machines, but instead partner with a third party company. She explained that at the time she had gone to inspect all of the sites involved within that route and get an understanding on how to build a vending company. She was then told that our organization was no longer buying vending machines which prompted her to contract with her vending partner. She remembered that during a later meeting amongst themselves it was discussed that there may come a time when buying a vending machine within our Program for a particular site may be advantageous, but not as a mass purchase of vending machines unless there was some kind of change. Richard Saperstein recalled this discussion occurring about 10 years ago and asked if any of the members also remembered. Nels Brown stated that he remembered this debate also and that it was decided that vending machines would no longer be purchased outright, but if the situation presented itself as in his particular instance; something would have to be done to keep the site functional. Richard Saperstein surmised that this would then be the time to purchase one. Beth Perring said it was agreed later that each request would be considered site by site.

Harold Petrofsky said that he remembered that former Program Chief, Kathy Yonkers, did a study regarding the purchase of vending machines in order to satisfy the request Gary DeFalco had made to purchase all of his machines. During the meeting Mr. DeFalco was on the line with a representative from Skytop Vending and according to the study that was done, it was determined that it was more cost effective to partner with a vending company. On the other hand, Mr. Petrofsky reasoned that when there is no company available another way was to use the services of other machines on site and if anyone needs a machine, the present vending company would place their own machine at the site.

B. Discussion-Update on new, waived and in progress site, Drazen Elez

All members were emailed a copy of this report prior to this meeting. Drazen began his report by first highlighting **Potential New Sites** with the Southern Nevada Health District. The Bureau was approached by the health district with the possibility of installing a new coffee cart in their building of approximately 250 employees and approximately 400-600 customers per day.

Drazen reported that he felt that the Southern Nevada Health District would be a lucrative site maintaining that during the few times he was at this site and during a half hour period he witness between 50-70 customers walking in that area. Drazen admitted that his only concern was that the Health District's contract for that current location would be expiring and they have yet to decide if they would renew this contract or move to another location. He explained that the District's contract decision was expected in the next few months which in turn will be relayed to the Bureau at which time the Bureau will proceed from there while keeping the Committee updated on its viability.

The DOE Support Unit Facility was discussed as an **Existing Site with Challenges**. Mr. Elez reported that after the past few months of hard work this facility has finally turned around with its presentation of good food and improved service. He added that those individuals who organize meetings for that facility are now reaching out to the grill to cater their meetings and internal events.

More **Existing Sites with Challenges** were discussed in the Northern Nevada locations as a result of change in partners. At the moment the Bureau was working on reopening sites after the problems involved with change of partners were experienced with BEN #22-Washoe County and BEN #14-DMV in Reno.

Nels Brown offered a comment regarding coffee carts in general by calling their operation as unstable based on his observations over the years. He then asked why the Bureau could not explore the possibility of having these carts positioned outside of a building which he felt would increase the foot traffic volume as much as three fold.

Beth Perring stated that she owned a kiosk located at the Riviera Hotel prior to entering the Program and acknowledged that she wished that it was an outside operation for the increased exposure. She realized, however that the summer heat would be a factor during the summer months. Bert Hansen agreed questioning the operation of coffee carts during the severe weather conditions in Reno to which Nels Brown answered that the cart can be covered with an awning to create a room with only the front of the coffee cart exposed and sides and back protected from the rain. Bill Schley stated that while he was sighted, he witnessed in California the benefits of such awnings which surrounded and protected the operations area including the cash register as well as the use of a propane unit to warm those working there.

Bill Schley discussed his new partner at the Reno City Hall, Joe's Good Java, in very positive terms with the prospects of adding an outside patio with tables, chairs and umbrellas. He stated that he felt that the presence of customers enjoying food and drink outside in fair weather would provide visual stimulation to add to the cart's business volume inside. Carol Ewing remembered that after seeing a coffee cart on a bicycle being pedaled by a sighted person which could travel up to 15 miles per hour years ago at a conference she and Russell Smith investigated the idea of a this interesting concept.

At this time Drazen Elez wished to make a slight correction stating that when the Bureau was approached about the SNHD coffee cart, it was felt to be beneficial if it was able to open any other possibilities that could be established there for the BEN Program, employees, staff and customers. Bert Hansen thanked Drazen for his excellent location update.

C. Discussion-Update of the Regulation Change related to Health and Retirement Increase,

Melaine Mason opened this discussion reminding all of the informative email she sent March 19, 2014 relating to this discussion which identified the progress and necessary development of this subject. After contacting the Legislative Council Bureau Ms. Mason said she learned that they were unable to meet their 1-2 week turnaround time as promised prompting another attempted follow up contact with

them. Ms. Mason surmised that one of the problems with communications stems from the fact that the day before (IFC) Interim Finance Committee was meeting, which involved Brenda Erdoes, LCB's legal counsel and the same person who also participates on this committee. Ms. Mason was expecting some communication with her shortly; however she explained that after the draft was returned various steps will follow. Ms. Mason reported that the proposed change draft was sent that day to the Department of Education; we then conduct a public workshop and also post a 30-day notice of the proposed changes commencing after that workshop. Ms. Mason named the next step as being one which would include a narrative to all at the next meeting which is planned every two months. The way in which comments will be made would be through the public workshops giving all an opportunity to make their desired changes, wording modification, then changes to the Policies and Procedures. The issue is the wording that would state that the amount will be removed in two sections and that Policy and Procedures will be set up. She then mentioned the voting requirements to determine the amount of change each year which will appear on the draft. The only timeframe Ms. Mason stated she felt unsure of was what was necessary for the Legislative Counsel Bureau to file the regulation also revealing that she was dependent on her governmental partners to resolve some of the time-frame issues that may come up. Aside from this Ms. Mason judged that at the most a four month wait would prevail and once some clarity is achieved she would follow up to all with an email. However, she explained that after the opening meeting law during NCBV Meeting was where the "wild card" would be forming.

Melaine Mason cautioned repeatedly that changes and suggestions should occur during the NCBV open meetings as once changes are expressed the procedure would have to be repeated setting the timeline months behind. Allaying any fears that unexpected language would appear, Melaine assured all that there was none and that it is simply a matter of removing the limits, and that the scrutiny regarding these changes was simply a means of putting control and knowledge regarding how much money would be spent. In stating this she then guaranteed all that the Bureau would provide updates on the fiscal climate in basing the decisions of these changes so that the limit removal does not become a problem. Ms. Mason assured all that the completion of these policy changes are getting closer and assured all of her continued email updates regarding this discussion.

Richard Saperstein substantiated Melaine Mason's assertion adding that there was no "mumbo jumbo" and that the Committee would find a way to vote on these new limits on an annual basis as a means of its own control. Harold Petrofsky asked if the proposed \$1000 per licensed year would be pro-rated due to the time it has taken to be approved and if they would receive an extra \$2000. Melaine Mason cautioned all that this revision was originally a discussion about a onetime distribution which then led to having an open forum of distributing as much money as is voted on annually and named this to be part of what has delayed the process. Ms. Mason addressed Harold Petrofsky's question directly by answering that the Operators would receive what they voted on and that this process that must unfold is a direct result of the inability to distribute more than the NAC states. She continued to clarify that once this is removed and the revised language can be added in accordance of with what the committee decides. Language such as one time distribution can be added, but she questioned if this should state that this is only a one-time distribution. In order to circumvent this is by removing the cap so that this distribution can be made. At this time, she admitted it opens up both positive and negative on how much to distribute.

Bert Hansen asked if she would consider the possibility of allowing a vote on the distribution only every 3-4 years in order to stifle any effort to have an excessive amount of votes. Ms. Mason answered that she would be happy to do so and for all to remember that a conclusive agreement must be made on whatever is discussed in the public workshop but would add this as a possibility.

Mr. Hansen urged strong caution on the possibility of overuse by viewing this policy change as a capricious way to draw from funds at will. Beth Perring asked if this policy of distribution would impact their retirement or life or health insurance benefit to which Richard Saperstein answered that this was the current discussion. He explained that the current limit of retirement was \$7000 and what Ms. Mason's and Bert Hansen's concern is suggesting, is that we take this vote once every so often which he recommended bi-annually in order to coincide with the State's bi-annual budget. In doing so, it can be determined how much retirement is to be distributed for that two year period and how much reimbursement money is available for submitting for health reimbursement costs. Retirement distributions are designed to be distributed in such a manner that Operators receive money back which they have worked for and should be used for retirement in order that Operators can have a comfortable lifestyle in the future without a grandiose dipping into the funds. In the matter of health cost reimbursements Richard Saperstein reasoned that with the aging of Operators so go the increase in medical costs. By using the flexibility of changing the amount of distribution in order to coincide with the costs associated with aging, and the economy are also factors as well.

Nels Brown made a comment and stated that it would not be too costly; I take advantage of the life insurance benefit payment for the protection of my wife and asked all to consider covering Operator's spouses and significant others as well. Mr. Brown expanded his explanation by adding that if something were to happen to his wife it would be a struggle to cover expenses and continue his business operation. Bert Hansen told Mr. Brown that the Bureau would have to budget annually and the amounts must be a known commodity and the amounts are not understood enough to budget. He also added that if an estimate amount of \$2500 per year for everyone who had a significant other who passed away that amount would have to be budgeted for everyone in the Program. Richard Saperstein interjected by stating that he understood Nels Brown's request to mean having an extra \$1000 available for life insurance for Operator's significant others. Mr. Brown admitted this was his point however he was not asking for anything more but that possibly the spouses could be covered so that it does not cause hardship for surviving Operators. Richard Saperstein stated that with 18 Operators in the Program @\$1000 benefit x 2, \$36,000 would bi-annually have to be budgeted. Look at the past 30 years; how many Operators have had their wife or significant other as partners in their business operation. Melaine Mason remarked that the NAC's and NRS do not cover this; we would have to time the possibility of this with the new legislation.

Drazen Elez reported to the best of his knowledge life insurance was not covered under the Randolph-Sheppard Act. It's a state specific statute and as Melaine Mason mentioned the state regulation would have to be revised or crafted in order to be added and come from state funds versus Federal funds. Richard Saperstein stated that these expenses could not originate from Federal monies earned but state and suggested that this item be discussed at another meeting. Mikie Yamada mentioned the availability of long term insurance with life insurance. Mr. Saperstein commented that he felt that Operators needed to concentrate on getting the retirement health reimbursement finished first and discuss her point after. Melaine Mason cautioned all that during an open meeting, the Agenda must be followed rather than introducing items not scheduled or posted asking this item be placed on the Agenda for a later time.

D. Reports from Subcommittees listed below:

1. Finance, Carol Ewing

Carol Ewing thanked those members who served with her on the subcommittee explaining that there was no report because there were no meetings due to the absence of issues.

2. Policies and Procedures, Harold Petrofsky

Harold Petrofsky had nothing to report at this time.

3. Training, William Schley

William Schley spoke of the training which had already begun with new operators using the training program that was crafted last year. He had the honor of speaking at the Sagebrush Conference on the subject of training. Though he had not been able to participate in the training sessions personally he anticipated doing so in the future. He reported there are 3 new trainees joining the Program increasing the total number of operators by 20%. Bill invited Carol Ewing's comments regarding training in which she participated. Ms. Ewing described the classes as excellent mentioning Paul Watson and Ed Manley teaching new concepts and ideas as well as encouraging all Operators to participate.

4. Legislative Watchdog, Kawana Pohe

Mr. Pohe was absent from this meeting.

5. Future Planning, Bert Hansen

Bert Hansen had nothing further to add to what was explained by Drazen Elez in Item 7B.

VIII. New Business

A. For Possible Action-Appointing a new subcommittee member of Nevada Committee of Blind Vendors for the years February 2014-February 2016.

Richard Saperstein asked all Chairpersons present of each subcommittee if they would retain their positions to which all, but absent Kawana Pohe agreed:

Subcommittee Chairpersons 2014-16

Finance, Carol Ewing

Policies and Procedures, Harold Petrofsky

Training, William Schley

Legislative Watchdog, Kawana Pohe (absent)

Future Planning, Bert Hansen

B. For Possible Action- Develop plan for scheduling future NCBV Meetings, Drazen Elez

Drazen Elez explained that this plan would be developed so Operator schedules could be based on scheduled meetings so that important topics could not be missed. He suggested a specific day of each month (i.e. the third Friday of each month). Richard Saperstein called for suggestions to which Carol Ewing commented that she thought that the bylaws stipulated quarterly meetings and special meetings called as needed and asked if the bylaws would need modified.

Richard Saperstein stated that no changes to the bylaws are needed as it was decided to meet every couple of months based on the workload using special meeting as well. He asked Melaine Mason for confirmation of this to which Ms. Mason stated that the bylaws state, "One meeting at least quarterly.." rather than the explicit rule of quarterly meetings. Nels Brown maintained that with holidays and such setting the schedule to read a certain day (i.e. third Friday of the month) may not always work, but suggested an alternative date as for example second or third of the month may be more reasonable. Drazen Elez said that the only problem with this proposal is that if pod training is scheduled, a specific Friday could be changed if it is found in advance that it falls on a holiday to which Richard Saperstein agreed with the option of this flexibility.

After review Melaine Mason reported that the bylaws state that, "A regular meeting of the NCBV will be held at least four times annually, so we are covered. Richard Saperstein suggested that they adopt the third Friday of every other month beginning with June 2014. All members will be in sync and make plans

to attend. In the case of holidays or special events those meetings could be changed. Carol Ewing offered the possibility of meeting on even months. **Bert Hansen made a motion that the Committee schedule meetings on the third Friday of every even month. Bill Schley seconded that and it passed unanimously.**

Bill Schley asked if this schedule would carry through to year 2015. Richard Saperstein answered that it would until such time the need to scale down to quarterly meetings was necessary and a vote would then resolve the matter.

C. Discussion/Possible Action-Annual Operator in-Service Training, Drazen Elez

Drazen Elez cited this training is a result of directives from the RSA 15 and RSA which require a mandatory in-service training for all Operators. The Randolph Sheppard Act states a similar obligation referring to states having annual meetings for training opportunities as well as State regulations. Based on these mandates, Mr. Elez suggested an annual Operator in-service training meeting schedule on Friday, June 13th which would satisfy having one in State Fiscal Year 2013 (S/B SF2014). The Operators would attend one of a couple of locations in Las Vegas and Northern Nevada for a day or so. Bert Hansen stated that he was under the impression that the Sagebrush Conference served as their Operator in-service training.

Bill Schley added that only 3 Nevada Operators attended the Sagebrush Conference in 2014. Bert Hansen commented that if this in-service training was deemed as mandatory, so should the attendance of the Sagebrush Conference. Mike Mulanax mentioned the expense of attendance. With the issue of expense introduced Mr. Saperstein stated that there was a yearly travel expense for Operators to attend meetings. Melaine Mason explained that in Vocational Rehabilitation training was a requirement for its staff and a grant is received by RSA to conduct this. She then began to describe the benefit of training to train one for Upward Mobility giving each Operator some form of training as well as the member's personal input whereas she wondered if a Conference was necessarily for training. Ms. Mason addressed the wishes they expressed during the last member's discussion to join together every year and the Bureau feels that it should be mandatory in order to discuss those items in the Strategic Plan as an active engagement. If training was only available in one location there were funds to spend to moving members from one place to another as finances were not a concern. She then reported that Terry Smith had already committed to fly in to conduct training where Operators and their sighted guides could attend with the Bureau paying expenses.

Melaine Mason asked if they would consider which subject of training they wished to review as she preferred that they not simply meet in order to satisfy requirements, but to learn the benefits of micro markets, for example. Drazen Elez added a reminder that during Terry Smith's strategic plan presentation it was agreed that part of Goal #1 was to initiate an annual vendor's meeting sponsored the Bureau.

Richard Saperstein admitted that there was much to share and that members seldom saw each other face-to-face, therefore it would be a benefit to both members and the Program to gather together once a year with an agenda and key in on certain subjects. Bert Hansen commented that during this meeting expenses should be budgeted to include something other than a warmed over sandwich for lunch. Melaine Mason lauded Benita McHenry and reminded all that Ms. McHenry made her Clark County Government Snack Bar location available during the Strategic Planning meeting and could organize the same plan if the members wished to visit a location for lunch. The more important advantage, she felt, was that of being together and to receive training and wished the Operators to aide in the structure of this training. She expressed her wish that this would be included in their motion to vote. The issue of per diem was discussed with Ms. Mason clarifying that per diem was paid if one travels more than 50

miles from your business location and finally discussed the Bureau's commitment to this proposed in-service training.

Richard Saperstein asked if a vote was required and if the member must issue the topics for discussion on the Agenda. Drazen Elez answered that a vote was not necessary and that an early agenda was already developed but not finalized. He advised that if there was a topic that they wished to be discussed during the meeting to contact him or their BEO and the Bureau would work with them to add it to the agenda. Mr. Saperstein asked if this training should be held in one location and if it was mandatory for all licensed Operators. Mr. Elez answered that video conferencing would be available in both northern and southern Nevada for those who are unable to travel but wish to attend and take part in the discussions. He added that if a Northern Nevada Operator wished to attend in person, there would be no restriction on this and that travel was an option, not a necessity. In the matter of whether the meeting was mandatory or not, Mr. Elez answered that it was. No other questions were forthcoming and Mr. Saperstein announced that the training meeting for **June 13th** would be planned. Melaine Mason asked for a vote. **Harold Petrofsky made a motion to have an in service meeting June 13th and Bill Schley seconded the motion and it and it passed unanimously.**

IX. Second Public Comment, Richard Saperstein

Carol Ewing wished to make four statements. In the first, she complimented the secretary for the manner in which the minutes were formatted describing them as excellent. The second was her mention of the American Council of the Blind Conference in Las Vegas at the Riviera Hotel July 10-20, 2014. She added that with some members belonging to the ACB or RSVA she was hopeful they would attend and join the 1,500 other attendees. For her third announcement Ms. Ewing reported that RSVA-AHEAD phoned her and asked if three Operators would speak in the afternoon of their program on Sunday (S/B Tuesday), July 15. She asked all to contemplate being added to the agenda and to contact her by the end of the month. Finally Ms. Ewing discussed the ACB Walk which would be held Sunday, July 13th and they asked our program again (as we did in 2011) to provide water, granola bars and refreshments for the walk. Ms. Ewing assured them that they would. During the last walk held in Northern Nevada she, Richard Saperstein, Nels Brown and Bill Schley paid for refreshments. Since it is being held in the south she asked southern members to consider helping with supplying refreshments for this event.

At 3:45pm Bill Schley announced his presence. He wished to discuss an update at the Reno DMV. He expressed his excitement in the fact that the coffee cart for that location would be in place the next week. Due to the fact that it is a state building the state health inspector will be there to inspect this new outfitted cart in the morning of Tuesday, April 22nd. Following that there was a meeting planned with BEN Staff, partner Joe Pierce and the DMV staff about 2pm to begin a soft opening that afternoon or the following day.

Drazen Elez mentioned that Lee Weiss, one of our trainees, has been in attendance at this meeting. Lee Weiss greeted the assembly and thanked the Administration for the opportunity to train in the new training program which he described as "awesome". He added that though he was in the food business for some time, he was still able to learn a tremendous amount of new information.

X. Discussion-Date for Next NCBV Meeting, Richard Saperstein

Friday, June 20, 2014 at 3:30pm was chosen.

XI. Adjournment, Richard Saperstein

Bill Schley made a motion to adjourn this meeting; seconded by Harold Petrofsky and it carried unanimously.

This meeting adjourned at 4:55pm.

